CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 8. NOVEMBER, 1936. Vol. XXVI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Changes in the Coronation Service.

Preaching on All Saints' Day in the Chapel Royal, the Bishop of Birmingham stated the case for changes in the Coronation Service which will, we are convinced, commend themselves very widely to British citizens, and we hope also to the authorities of the Church of England. The *Times* of Nov. 2 reports Dr. Barnes as follows:

> The Bishop asked whether changes in the form of the Coronation service might not now wisely be made. That the essentials of the Coronation rite should remain unchanged, he said, all would probably agree. They were alike fitly symbolic and richly hallowed by time. But they were placed within the setting of the English Communion Office, and that setting could with advantage be reshaped. Many Churchpeople would prefer that the Coronation should be independent of the Communion Office and that the Sovereign should make, quietly and unobserved, such personal religious preparation for his Coronation as he deemed right.
>
> Again, there were a vast number of people, truly religious, for whom the sacrament of Holy Communion was something alien. The Society of Friends and the Salvation Army had no sacraments. The existence of such bodies could not be ignored. No national occasion should unnecessarily draw attention to religious differences. Was it not desirable to make the Coronation service an occasion of worship which would invite the spontaneous co-operation of the greatest possible number of good and religious citizens?
>
> It was inconceivable that the Coronation should not be broadcast, but he could not conceive that the consecration prayer of the Communion Office should be sent out over the wireless. Yet, unless a

change was made, either that prayer must be broadcast or the service as received by the nation would be mutilated. The question whether the service might be filmed would come up for discussion. He would welcome an adverse decision; but until television was perfected the popular desire to see the ceremony reproduced on the screen was so natural that denial might well be deemed difficult. But the sacramental —he used the term in its narrow sense—part of the service could not be filmed.

Since the last Coronation the Nonconformist Churches had grown in status and in influence. No religious service was now properly representative of the nation unless the Free Churches took part in it. But owing to the present state of the law it was doubtful whether Free Church ministers could rightly take any but the most subordinate part in a service of which the Anglican Communion Office supplied the setting. Yet Westminster Abbey was a Royal Peculiar, subject solely to the authority of the Crown. By established custom the Crown took over the church from the Dean and Canons during the necessary period of preparation that ended after the Coronation. There was then, he submitted, no reason whatever why at a special service, uncombined with the Anglican Communion Office, non-Anglican ministers should not officiate. Personally he would like to see, among Nonconformist leaders thus taking part in the Coronation, the General of the Salvation Army, who controlled a great organization, active for good among our poorest citizens.

He knew some would say that in such a matter as the Coronation the officials concerned must be bound by tradition. A quotation from a historical survey written in the *Times* of June 19, 1911, before the last Coronation, effectively disposed of such an argument. It was then said: 'The Coronation Order occupies a unique position among English services. While its central portions, the Anointing of the King and his Investiture with the ensigns of kingly power, remain necessarily unchanged, no other service has undergone so much revision in details, and none reflects in so many curious ways the ideas and the language of different periods of our history.'

If we can secure precedents for past adjustments to contemporary needs, we strengthen our case for reform in the minds of many; but after all reform needs no precedents, for it is justified if it can be shown to be needful and beneficial.

The Rev. M. E. Aubrey in his Presidential Address[1] delivered to the annual meeting of the Federal Council of the Free Churches on Sept. 21, 1936, pleaded for recognition of the Free Churches at the coming Coronation Service, basing his plea on the important part played by them in the religious and political life of the British Empire.

'We feel that, as a simple matter of justice and fairness, recognition in this country is due to the Free Churches through their appointed representatives as much as to the Church of England.'

[1] *The Free Churches in our National Life.* Independent Press, Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

'We are Free Churches, . . . entitled in our unity to be admitted into equal partnership with the Church of England in her service of leading and expressing the Christian thought and aspiration of our people.'

'And at the present time, if our Christian brethren in the Anglican Church, to whom in so many ways we have happily been drawn closer in recent years, would themselves call us to their side in partnership, I believe it would go further than anything else they could do to heal our so-called "unhappy divisions."'

Before we can have reunion with the Free Churches, we must grant them recognition, not merely in word but in deed. If our Archbishops would press for such recognition to be granted in the ceremonial of the Coronation Service, we feel sure that it could not be refused.

Whither the Church of England?

On October 24 the *Tablet* (the chief Roman Catholic weekly in this country) published a significant article entitled 'The Reunion Movement in the Church of England.' This article, 'without comment,' was re-published, by permission, in the *Church Times* of October 30. The article in question, contributed by a Roman Catholic layman, describes a recent meeting in London of English clergymen who are in favour of reunion with the Church of Rome. This movement is a growing one, as the following quotation indicates:

'We are exactly 1,016 clergymen . . . who have these last eight years subscribed to the faith of the Council of Trent, and pledged ourselves to preach it to our parishes. Moreover, some two thousand others are in sympathy with our aims, and join us every year with their parishioners in a Novena for the return of the Anglican Church to the Papacy.'

The Roman Catholic layman asked one of the leaders of the movement, 'What conditions would you claim for a mass return?' The reply was made:

'No conditions at all. It will be the Pope's business to impose them. Our task is to make ourselves worthy of God's grace to be reunited with the true fold.'

The Roman Catholic layman concluded his interview with the question, 'Is not the Church of England hopelessly divided?' To this the answer came:

'So she was, and still is to a great extent, but in eight years we have increased to over three thousand holding the same Faith, *i.e.* one-fourth of the Anglican clergy in Great Britain. Is this not sufficient sign that God is at last listening to your prayers and ours, though perhaps not in the way you or we expected?'

Some of our readers may dispute the accuracy of the figures, but those who really know what has been happening in our English parishes for years past will feel that there is no sound reason for doubting them. The movement for Romanizing the Church of England has advanced steadily, according to plan. The successive stages in that plan would seem to be as follows :

(1) The introduction of Roman ritual and Roman vestments into our Church of England services, accompanied by the teaching of Roman sacramental doctrine.

(2) The insistence on non-communicating attendance at Sunday morning sung Masses, which have been substituted for Morning Prayer and sermon, with a monthly Holy Communion.

(3) The substitution of the Roman pastoral system, with compulsory confession, for the English pastoral system of house-to-house visitation.

(4) The Reservation of the Consecrated Wafer and its retention for purposes of adoration, both public and private, in our parish churches.

(5) One more stage yet remains to be accomplished in the Romanizing campaign. It is the Disestablishment of the Church of England in the name of 'spiritual independence' and the appointment of bishops by the 'representative' church bodies. When, as a result of this, the necessary episcopal majority has been secured, the dramatic admission of the Church of England into the Church of Rome will then be consummated.

The number of English parishioners who are being won to the Church of Rome by these Romanizing methods is a small fraction of those who are being driven from the Church of England by them. Mr. Peter Hutton in the *Nineteenth Century* for November, in an article entitled 'The Opium of the People,' writes :

> 'Men to-day wonder how it is that the Church of England, which has had a totally unobstructed, State-subsidised opportunity for three hundred years, appears only to have succeeded in turning England into a country of pagans' (p. 547).

One reason for this paganization, which by the way Mr. Hutton does not offer, is this. Whilst the Church of England was true to her essential constitution, which is as deeply rooted in the spirit of the New Testament as in the temper of the English people, she retained the allegiance of the main body of the

nation. Since she began to abandon those principles and practices she has steadily lost her hold on the nation.

The recent record of the Church of Rome abroad — and it is not a new one, although those who are ignorant of Church history seem to assume that it is — is of a kind which should make all patriotic Englishmen feel a real apprehension at the growth of Roman influence in Great Britain. The increase in the numbers of impoverished and prolific Roman Catholic immigrants from abroad, whether Irish or Polish, is not the concern of our Church authorities but of the State. Our Church authorities, however, are responsible for the increase of the influence of Romanist propaganda within the Church of England, and especially among its clergy. Whilst we are wasting energy and dividing our forces by foolish talk about spiritual independence and by negotiating futile ecclesiastical alliances abroad, we are losing vast multitudes of our fellow-countrymen to secularism, and are permitting an increasing number of those that remain with us to be corrupted by an obscurantist, arrogant and intolerant Romanizing propaganda.

Modern Churchmen favour the ideal of a comprehensive English Church : they favour a large latitude in doctrinal teaching : they favour (within acceptable limits) variety in form of public worship : they believe in education and the growing intellectual, moral and spiritual enlightenment which should accompany it as the best and surest method of securing both loyalty to, and efficiency in, the Church of England, as the chief religious organ of the English nation.

What we need, and what we so seldom get to-day, is a clear presentation of the character and claims of our National Church such as may be found, not merely in the writings of the judicious Hooker, but in the teaching of such modern scholars and prelates as Thirlwall, Stubbs of Oxford, Mandell Creighton, Lightfoot and Westcott. And last, but not least for popular purposes, in *Our National Church* by the late Dr. Percy Dearmer.

The Journalist and the Archbishop.

The *Listener* of October 28 contains the account of an interview granted by Archbishop Temple to Mr. Howard Marshall, who was desirous of discovering 'What is the Church for?' Mr.

Howard Marshall felt this question to be urgent in view of the state of the modern world,

> 'its scientific knowledge, its economic problems, its threats of war, its tragedies of unemployment and poverty, its experiment in government.'

As a result he sought to elicit the Archbishop's views on pacificism, disarmament, social conditions, unemployment, the depressed areas, the obligation of voluntary poverty, and whether the Church ought not to give a lead in all these issues.

The Delphic oracle replied with the caution and, in some cases, the ambiguity which characterizes oracular utterances. The terms used in the questions — for example, the term 'the Church'—demanded definition. In other cases, the things which it was suggested the Church might do, were incapable of accomplishment. For instance, the clergy are incompetent to pronounce authoritatively on a great number of the perplexing economic, social and political problems with which this country is faced to-day. Moreover the clergy themselves differ greatly in their conclusions. Therefore no good purpose can be served by inducing them to deliver themselves publicly in these matters: though as Chistians who recognize their duty to their neighbour; as educated men who are appointed to be public teachers in moral and spiritual matters; as British citizens who have some power of control over the policy of the British State, they ought to give the most serious thought to these problems, and to encourage others to do so.

We have selected three sentences from the Archbishop's reply which seem to us to put clearly the duty of clergymen in these matters:

> 'The clergy . . . should stir up their congregations to desire knowledge of economic matters, but it is not their province to supply it.'
>
> 'It is not our business to try to supply guidance in place of the exercise of conscience. . . . We need very much more organization of the promotion of thought in church on these matters — not necessarily agreement. . . .'
>
> 'You should be trying to live in fellowship with Christ in such a way that you make up your *own* mind about what ought to be done under the guidance of His Spirit.'

There were other queries put by Mr. Howard Marshall to which Dr. Temple's answers are less convincing. Mr. Marshall, like the vast majority of British laymen, regards the Sermon on the Mount as the *Magna Carta* of the Christian religion. Dr.

Temple appeared to think that there were other elements in the Christian religion which were of as much importance, but he did not specify them.

Had the Christian Church been loyal to the great centralities and simplicities of the Sermon on the Mount, it is more than probable that the Christian religion would have become long ere now the religion of mankind and would have been producing such beneficial results in the personal, social, economic and political life of humanity that no man of intelligence and goodwill would wish to dethrone it. Dogmatic controversies, ecclesiastical rivalries, ritual observances, and many other things (some of them sub-Christian, others anti-Christian) have seduced the Church from loyalty to the spirit of the Sermon as the supreme and essential thing in the Christian religion. Until the Church recovers that loyalty we can see little hope of her becoming the supreme means of advancing the Kingdom of God in the modern world.

Like the vast majority of British laymen, Mr. Howard Marshall regards the divisions among Christians in this country as a great source of weakness and scandal, and an insuperable barrier to the triumph of Christian principles in our national policy. Here it seems to us Dr. Temple showed less concern than we should have expected. He pointed to the apathy and prejudice of Church and Chapel folk (a very small minority of the nation) as an excuse for inaction. Mr. Howard Marshall's suggestion that it was the business of the Church authorities to lead in this matter, and not wait until they are pushed forward from behind, and upward from below, appears to us to be much to the point. Leadership from behind — the method of the famous Duke of Plazatoro — did more perhaps than anything else to ruin the great Liberal movement in Europe. It is the business of leaders to lead in difficult and dangerous advances. Church authorities need to be far more influenced by national feeling — the *vox populi, vox Dei* — than by the votes of representative Church bodies, and the exclusive temper of church-goers whose financial support may be withdrawn and their denominational loyalties affronted by a forward Church policy which is concerned for the recovery to the Church of the nation as a whole, rather than by the retention of the 'righteous.'

THE TRANSUBSTANTIATED TRADITIONALIST.[1]

A volume of considerable significance and interest, *What is the Faith?* has just appeared from the pen of the Rev. Nathaniel Micklem, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford—the Congregationalist Theological College in the University.

The Principal offers in his volume a definition of the Christian Faith, not a defence of it. The definition is somewhat of a mixed grill. The author, like many contemporary Free Churchmen, exhibits the influence of Barthian theology, which Adolf von Harnack described as 'a desperado theology,' and which Professor Garvie has referred to as one of the minor evils created by the Great War. Barthianism seems, however, to have an apologetic value for Protestants in peril, and if it does not provide them with a comprehensible defence, it at least supplies them with a number of catch-words and phrases which, if they do not enlighten the pew, at least equip the pulpiteer with an impressive vocabulary.

Mr. Micklem also exhibits the influence of English Catholic Modernism. This school, like that of the Barthians, is not easily comprehensible to the pew, but it has been created by the apologetic needs of a Catholicism enlightened by modern science, historical research and Biblical criticism. This school seeks to retain the values of our Catholic heritage, but to exclude its errors and weaknesses.

The third element in Mr. Micklem's religious make-up is his ancestral Congregationalism. The Congregationalists were in their theology, until recent times, English Calvinists. Their Calvinist dogmas have become shadowy, but something of the Calvinist spirit survives. To-day even the sternest of them would not burn Servetus, but would tell him that as 'a Black-Heathen'[2] he had neither part nor lot with them.

When these three strains are recognized in Mr. Micklem's treatise readers will realize the significance of his book, which can claim to be original, not in its ideas, but in their combination.

A good example of this is seen in Mr. Micklem's treatment of miracles. He defends the miraculous, but he does not be-

[1] *What is the Faith?* By Nathaniel Micklem. (Hodder and Stoughton, 1936; 7/6.)

[2] Black-Heathen is a term applied in Conservative Congregationalist circles to the Blackheath group—a Congregationalist Modernist Society.

lieve in miracles in the ordinary sense of that term; as acts happening within the natural sphere (the world of space and time) but which are in contradiction to the known laws of Nature. The miraculous, for Mr. Micklem, is a Divine action originating outside the sphere of space and time, but manifesting itself within that sphere, but in such a way as not to break the laws of Nature — its uniformity of sequence. The miraculous is the Divine action, unveiled to the eye of faith, operating in human history. Modernists have no objection to this conviction; indeed, it is their own. English Modernists recognize this Divine action in the whole of the creative process, and supremely in the life of our Lord, and in the founding and expansion of the Christian Church — God's new creation. What Modernists object to is describing it by the misleading term miraculous. One of a number of objections to the traditional belief in the miraculous is, as Dean Inge pointed out, that it habituates Christians to look for God 'through the chinks of His universe,' instead of as manifest in divers modes and in various degrees in the whole creative process and supremely in Christ.

Another instance of this ambiguity is found in Mr. Micklem's retention and use of the term dogma. His conception of dogma differs widely from the traditionalist definition of dogma. Why then does the Principal retain the word dogma, a word as unattractive and as incomprehensible to the modern man as the word miraculous? It is because to-day in traditionalist circles these terms are the shield and breastplate of orthodoxy. If we assert that we believe in 'the miraculous,' if we affirm that we hold all the 'dogmas' of the Church, no traditionalist shall draw a bow at a venture to smite us between the joints of our harness. But woe betide us if we discard these terms because our views about the nature of miracles and the authority of dogma have altered. We shall then go as defenceless in the field of modern religious controversy as the heroic mediaeval knight who rode all day in the tournament clad only in his lady's mantle. Yet the retention and parade of this traditionalist phraseology must seem to represent us as holding views which in obedience to the demand of modern science and modern history we have abandoned, and as a consequence we shall fail to commend to the modern man the Christian religion.

It is Mr. Micklem's fear that he may be stigmatized as a Modernist, which is undoubtedly the reason for his retention and use of all his ambiguous phraseology. His detestation of the terms Modernist and Modernism are seen in his description of Dr. Brunner that he 'is as far removed as possible from being an unbeliever or even a Modernist' (p. 139). They are equally evident in a new definition of Modernism which his book contributes: 'The abandonment of the Christian faith coupled with an unwillingness to take the consequences' (p. 106). This is a cleverer but a not less malicious misrepresentation of Modernism than that propounded by the Roman Pontiff Pius X: 'Modernism is the compendium and poisonous essence of all heresies.'

The Modernist has not abandoned Christianity, but certain ecclesiastical dogmatic formulations and discredited accretions which are not of the essence of the Christian religion and obscure its essential truth in the eyes of the modern man. Let it be emphatically reiterated that the English Modernist is fully prepared 'to take the consequences' of his teaching.

Mr. Micklem's definition of Modernism may, with the alteration of one term, be fitly used to describe his own Micklemism—the abandonment of Traditionalism coupled with an unwillingness to take the consequences—for Mr. Micklem, notwithstanding his repudiation of the term, is essentially a Modernist. As a historical and Biblical critic, he is a Modernist. In his understanding of Christian doctrine he is a Modernist, for he distinguishes between the content and the form, the essence and its symbol. In his emphasis on the value of continuity in Christian thought and Christian institutions, and their readjustment to meet the needs of our own day, he is a Modernist. In his serious endeavour to re-state and to re-interpret Christian dogmas in the light of modern thought, he is a Modernist. Yet, misled by his hostile references to Modernism and his retention of traditionalist phraseology, superficial readers of Mr. Micklem will undoubtedly regard him as a Traditionalist.

Modernists are of two kinds: (1) the plain Modernist, be he Black-Heathen or Modern Churchman, whom we may describe as the transformed Traditionalist, and (2) the concealed Modernist, whom we may describe as the transubstantiated Tradition-

alist. The mediaeval doctrine of Transubstantiation stated that when the sacred elements were transubstantiated their substance was changed but their accidence remained unchanged. Mr. Micklem's 'substance' (*i.e.* his inner thought) has been changed, but his 'accidence' (*i.e.* the phrases in which he expresses that thought) are unchanged. But let no unwary critic, be he Traditionalist or be he Modernist, think that he is going to get Mr. Micklem by the short hairs in a short run. He is the most clever of theological controversialists, and is as hard for the hounds of orthodoxy or of unorthodoxy to capture, as is an electric hare.

Mr. Micklem's book is not only a skilful piece of theological writing by a man of culture and a clever controversialist, but it is much more. It points to the changes which are affecting the Congregationalist Denomination, those changes which Principal Micklem represents and also those changes which he resents. It is one more piece of evidence that the spirit of Protestant Nonconformity in this country is undergoing a change in a Liberal Catholic and Modernist direction which promises at no distant date reunion between the Church of England and our Free Churches.

World Fellowship through Religion.

Sir Francis Younghusband and his colleagues have done a notable service by organizing the World Congress of Faiths which met in London during the summer. There have been a number of such Parliaments of Religion, promoted perhaps more by scientific than by religious interest. The purpose, however, of this gathering was to harness together the world's religious convictions and spiritual ideals in the service of universal human fellowship.

Human history abounds with religious rivalries, the conflicts of competing faiths, and the permanent divisions which they would seem to have created among mankind. The hope of uniting humanity, by means of that which has so often separated it, is an original and adventurous undertaking. Whether it can be achieved remains to be seen. The materialism of our modern civilization—due, in some measure, to the most unfortunate conflicts between Science and Religion in the nineteenth century—threw science into the arms of materialism in a way which might

never have happened had Christian religious leaders shown themselves more sympathetic to the scientists in their search for truth. We are now witnessing a turn of the tide, and not a few of our scientists realize to-day the harm which has been done by trying to build our civilization not on a spiritual, but on a materialist, foundation. That great scientist, Professor J. S. Haldane, brings this out most forcibly in his fine paper on 'Science and Religion' contributed by him to the World Congress of Faiths, although death precluded him from actually reading it to the Congress. He concludes his paper with these words:

> Materialism is a form of naïve belief which is easily understood by all nations, both Western and Eastern, and it seems to me unfortunate that Western civilization, with all the superficial advantages which the successful study of physical science confers upon it, has come to stand in the eyes of many in Eastern countries for little more than materialism. But materialism forms no basis for honesty, charity, regard for truth, loyalty, or art; and without these real civilization does not exist, and any apparent civilization is quite unstable. The real strength of both Western and Eastern civilizations lies in their religions, and an understanding and respect for their religious ideas is essential for mutual understanding.
>
> I think that with mutual understanding of different forms of religious belief the differences between them will tend to disappear. In mathematical and physical science there is already little or no difference in what is believed by different nations. Religion is a far more difficult matter; but I can see no ultimate reason why, in matters of religion, similar agreement should not be reached, and I hope that the meetings of this Congress will act as a powerful influence in this direction.'

The aim of the Congress is thus defined by one of its leaders:

> 'There was no attempt to compare the chief religions, or to try to find their highest common factor or least common measure: the purpose was to discover what the various and varied faiths can contribute towards the establishment of world fellowship, and to discuss the hindrances to it.'

In short, the purpose of the gathering was essentially practical and pacific. Among the contributors of the twenty Congress papers were: Prof. Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, Prof. Nicolas Berdiaeff, Prof. S. N. Das Gupta, Sir Abdul Qadir, Rev. J. S. Whale, Dr. W. J. Stein, and Prof. J. Emile Marcault. These papers will be published shortly in a single volume,[1] and we anticipate for them a wide circulation.

We are glad to note that the Congress will meet next year in Oxford from July 23 to 27.

[1] *Faiths and Fellowship*. World Congress of Faiths, 17 Bedford Square, London, W.C.1.

THE 1937 MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE.

The coming Annual Conference of the Modern Churchmen's Union will be held at Girton College, Cambridge, from Monday, August 30, to Saturday, Sept. 4, 1937. The theme selected for consideration is 'Christianity and the Present Religious Crisis.' The Dean of St. Paul's has consented to deliver the Presidential Address. The causes and character of the present religious crisis, the failure of the Church to deal with it adequately, the reasons for this failure and the nature of the remedies demanded, are a matter of deep concern to all who desire that our nation may become united in the fellowship of Christ's religion, but from which they are becoming rapidly separated into opposing factions of destructive secularists and superstitious obscurantists.

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM (I.A.R.F.)

By the Rev. H. P. KINGDON, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.

THE main objects of this Society, as reconstituted in 1920, are :

To open and maintain communications with free Christian groups in all lands who are striving to unite religion and liberty, and to increase fellowship and co-operation among them.

To bring into closer union the historical liberal Churches, the liberal elements in all Churches, and isolated congregations and workers for religious freedom.

To draw into the same fellowship other religious groups throughout the world which are in essential agreement with our ways of thinking.

The Association has grown out of the International Congress of Free Christians and other religious liberals, which was founded (under a slightly different name) in 1900, and held conferences at London (1901), Amsterdam (1903), Geneva (1905),

Boston, U.S.A. (1907 and 1920), Berlin (1910), Paris (1913), Leiden (1922), and Prague (1927). At the conference at Arnhem in 1930 the name was changed to the present title, and further meetings were held at St. Jall in 1932, at Copenhagen in 1934, and at Arnhem again this summer.

Apart from the individual members, there are now twenty 'member' groups, of which the largest, the *Philippine Church*, is now about five million strong, while the Czechoslovakian Church numbers nearly a million. As the Association is by no means homogeneous, it seems best, before outlining its central activities, to give some description of these member-groups. In doing this the writer will draw very largely upon the recently-published *Handbook of the Association*,[1] which is the chief authority for most of the following statements. The numbers quoted refer, unless otherwise stated, to the position in 1930. At present the member-groups from America, Denmark, Great Britain, and Transylvania are largely Unitarian, whereas those of Czechoslovakia, Esthonia, Norway, the Philippines, Sweden, and Switzerland, etc., are members of the recognized 'State Church,' while other countries have members both in the 'established' and the 'free' churches.

First, the *American Unitarian Association* was founded in 1825 'to diffuse knowledge and promote the interests of pure religion, which in accordance with the teachings of Jesus is summed up in love to God and love to man.' In 1920 the membership was 60,000. Almost as large is the *Univeralist* Church, founded in 1770. Its principles, as put forward in the Boston Declaration of 1899, are :

'1. The Universal Fatherhood of God.

2. The Spiritual Authority and Leadership of His Son, Jesus Christ.

3. The trustworthiness of the Bible as containing a revelation of God.

4. The certainty of just retribution for sin.

5. The final harmony of all souls with God.'

[1] Edited by C. J. Bleeker, Ph.D. (The Lindsay Press, Essex Hall, London, W.C.2. 1/-.)

Apparently the differences between the various Churches in America are not so sharp as in Europe. Some of the leaders of American Unitarianism have recently been getting down to Thomas Aquinas and Karl Barth, and there is considerable co-operation with the Episcopal and other Churches, even Jews and Roman Catholics, in such matters as social reform.

Belgium provides a small independent *Liberal Protestant Church* at Brussels, with branches at Ghent and Charleroi. Similarly in Copenhagen there is a self-contained *Danish Unitarian Congregation* under Thorvold Kierkegoard. In the Danish State Church, thanks to the pioneer work of Grundtoig, Hans Anderson, and other nineteenth-century authors, there is also an influential liberal element. In *Esthonia* the Protestant Association was established with widespread enthusiasm in 1925, but some of the branches have failed for lack of trained leadership, and the movement has lost the support of many for whom it was not enough. *Czechoslovakia* contributes one of the strongest and most interesting member-groups. Besides the vigorous *Unitarian Church in Prague*, which has branches all over the country, there is the rather less Protestant *Czechoslovak Church*, which was established on January 8th, 1920, soon after the inauguration of the republic, and has grown by the secession of large numbers of dissenters from Rome. Under the able leadership of Patriarch Prochazka, who was elected, like the bishops and ministers, by a Church Assembly, this Church has stood for freedom of conscience, liturgical forms (often still as much in the Catholic tradition as is our Anglican Prayer Book) in the native language, and a democratic church order. In doctrine it is slightly more liberal and more protestant than the Church of England, but hardly more so than the Modern Churchmen's Union. The general Assembly has accepted a 'Doctrine of the Christian Religion' as 'the standard of belief, as to the nature of God's personality revealed by Jesus Christ, as to the essentials of the Christian moral order, and as to the meaning of Christian duty to promote the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth.' In the words of the Patriarch,[2] this Church is 'prepared to defend the precious heritage of the pure Gospel and of religious toleration against the hostile attacks of Roman Catholic

[2] In *The Handbook*, p. 44.

clericalism and of barbarian atheism.' The Church sent delegates to the Stockholm and Lausanne Conferences and is keenly interested in such ecumenical movements.

In *France* the one and a half million Protestants are divided between the Lutheran Church and the Reformed Church, which, though predominantly Calvinistic, has contained a liberal group led by such men as Albert Réville and Athanase Coqueril. These had enlisted the good will of writers like Taire and Michelet, but in 1872 the attempt to enforce a compulsory confession of faith split the Reformed Church into two factions. This gravely weakened the Church, but thanks largely to the conciliatory spirit of the liberals and their recent tendency to stress mystical piety rather than doctrinal assertion as the primary need of Christianity, there are strong hopes that this unfortunate schism will soon be healed. The French unit of the I.A.R.F. is called the *Fellowship of Liberal Pastors*. *Alsace-Lorraine* has its own special *Evangelical Protestant Union*, influenced most by Schweitzer and still more by Prof. D. Holtzmann. The majority of the theologians in each of the two Established Churches of these provinces, the Alsatian Church Confederation and the Reformed Church, are liberal and undogmatic.

In *Germany* the position of the Liberal Protestants is notoriously difficult. Even before the war the great University Liberals were too preoccupied with their academic researches to interest themselves much in Church Politics, while many of the laity were corrupted with the cares of new-found riches. The post-war despair lent colour to the reactionary pessimism of Karl Barth, and now Liberalism has given birth to a stronger bastard in the shape of the *German Christian*, who seeks to superimpose the mysticism of Blut und Boden upon the Christian tradition. Most of the German members of the I.A.R.F., however, have joined the opposing 'Confessional Church,' though not of course the theologically reactionary wing of it led by Niewoller and called the Confessional Front. No independent private associations are tolerated in the Third Reich, so liberals are working entirely in the established churches.

Holland is the home not only of the Secretariat, but of the third largest contingent of the I.A.R.F. There are about

800,000 liberal Protestants, comprising practically the whole of the *Church of the Remonstrance* (formed after the expulsion of the Armenians in 1618), most of the *Mennonites*, some Lutherans and about half of the State Church (the Dutch Reformed Church), the other half of which is Calvinistic. In 1870 the first attempt was made to combine these four groups into one unit, the '*Nederlandsche Protestanten Bond*.' Since 1923 there has also been a Central Committee for Free Protestantism, which has its own wireless committee to direct broadcasts, for about seven hours in each week. There is also a flourishing Youth Movement which arranges excellent summer camps for several thousands of boys and girls, both in Holland and abroad. Several of the theological professorships at Amsterdam, and especially Leiden (where Professor van Holk, the Vice-President, and in many ways the moving spirit, of the I.A.R.F. is situated), are occupied by men of a liberal turn of mind.

The *Hungarian* (7,000) and *Transylvanian* (73,000) representatives are Unitarians, and go back to Bishop Francis David in the sixteenth century. Since his time there has been much persecution, first from Catholics, then from Calvinists (1605—1691), and finally from the Hapsburgs, who encouraged the Jesuits. Since the war many Unitarians have migrated from Transylvania to find more congenial quarters in Budapest.

The Indian member is the well-known *Brahma Samaj* (='Union of seekers after God'), which has notoriously been influenced by Christian ideals. Founded over a hundred years ago by Raja Rammohun Roy, it also numbers among its leaders Keshub Shunder Sen and Devendranath Tagore, father of the poet Rabindranath, and has some 19,000 adherents. The services in the Quaker-like meeting-houses are in complete contrast with the temple rituals of Hinduism. The note of theism stands out against the prevailing pantheism of India, and there is nothing incongruous in this body, whose influence is out of all proportion to its numbers, belonging to the I.A.R.F.

Italy contributes a group of 8,000, called '*The Religious Progress*,' while *Norway* has a small *Group of Liberal Christians* who have encountered much opposition from the 'orthodox.' In *Sweden*, too, liberal Christianity has met with a set-back since the death of Archbishop Söderblom in 1931, and

the *Swedish Religious Reformation Union* only numbers about fifty clergy besides its lay members. Its congress of 1931 was ruined by ecclesiastical opposition in the press: but its summer assembly in 1935 was well attended and most successful. There is a strong undercurrent of liberal sentiment in Scandinavian religion as well as politics: what is needed is to bring it to the surface.

The *Philippine Independent Church*, on the other hand, numbers well over three million members. Like the Czechoslovakian Church it is the product of a wholesale secession from the Church of Rome — at the end of the Spanish-American War. It did not join the I.A.R.F. till 1930. But its great Archbishop, Aglipay, began his liberating work in 1899.

Finally, in *Switzerland*, the tradition of D. F. Strauss, who was appointed professor in Zurich in 1839, is still strong. The *Swiss Union for Free Christianity* was founded in 1871, and is on good terms with the other clergy, though the growing influence of Karl Barth, returned an exile from his adopted Germany, is threatening to have a bull-like effect in this happy china-shop, where French and German-speaking Christians have worked quietly and successfully together.

It remains to survey the central activities of the Association. First, the *General Assembly*, composed of delegates of all the member-groups, meets every three years. It appoints an *Executive Committee*, consisting of a President (at present, Dr. Alfred Hall of Sheffield), a Vice-President (Professor Van Holk of Leiden), and six other members. But the most permanent organism is the *Secretariat*, consisting of three Dutch Ministers who give part time to the work, Drs. W. Noordhoff, H. Faber, and C. J. Bleeker. Their office is at Utrecht, Nieuwe Gracht 27, and they travel frequently to visit their members. There is also a flourishing Youth Section, called the *Leiden International Bureau*.

At this year's conference at Arnhem, which the writer attended, the following declaration was issued:

> 'The Arnhem Conference of 1936 on "Rethinking Liberal Christianity," attended by delegates from eleven countries, reasserts its unity of spirit and affirms its earnest desire to co-operate in theological study and religious work.

This Conference declares its conviction:

1. That the first condition for a vital message for our time is a deeper belief in the guidance of God, our Father, in personal and social life, and His revealing presence in nature and in history; a recognition of the dignity of man and the value of human personality; and a faith in the possibility of communal life in the spirit of Christ.
2. That for such a message further study and research are required in regard to:
   (*a*) the philosophical foundation of religious knowledge;
   (*b*) a new understanding of the Bible in the light of modern knowledge, as a source of guidance for life to-day;
   (*c*) a theology of the Holy Spirit, based upon religious experience and leading to fresh comprehension of the immanence and transcendence of God;
   (*d*) an earnest endeavour to apply the ethical principles of Christianity to personal, social, economic and international problems;
   (*e*) a fresh advance in practical theology, especially in regard to worship, religious education and pastoral work.
3. That in the present world situation we must reinterpret our fundamental ideals of civil and religious liberty in accordance with the needs of our time, assert the autonomy of the churches in their spiritual tasks, and vindicate the principles of international righteousness.

We therefore call on all our member-groups, individual members, and friends of religious freedom to come to the Thirteenth Congress of the Association at Oxford in 1937 (August 3rd to 8th) to confess our common faith in

Liberal Christianity, the World's Need.'

Although this next conference is on Anglo-Saxon soil and after the devaluation of the continental 'gold'-currencies is scarcely likely to be really representative of the whole Association, it is an opportunity for members of the Modern Churchmen's Union to learn more of this movement which should not be missed.

WOMEN DEACONS IN THE EARLY CHURCH

By Canon C. H. Norton, M.A.

THE Archbishops' Commission on the Ministry of Women naturally considered the position of deaconesses, and its conclusions are expressed in these words :

> ' We believe it to be of great importance that the office of deaconess should be developed to its full possibilities, and that the Church should define as clearly as possible the status of the deaconess and the work to which she is commissioned. In our opinion it should be recognized that a deaconess is in Holy Orders, and that the " grace of orders " is bestowed upon her by the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands with prayer. This Order should not be regarded as equivalent with the diaconate of men, but rather as the one existing Holy Order for women. It should, however, carry with it recognition of the deaconess as one of the clergy, together with such consequences as follow in respect of precedence and membership of ecclesiastical bodies. We think that a service for the ordination of a deaconess should be included along with the other ordination services in the Ordinal.'

This definite recognition that a deaconess is in Holy Orders is eminently satisfactory, but the suggestion that ' this Order should not be regarded as equivalent with the diaconate of men ' is far from being equally acceptable. It finds no support in the records of the Early Church, and in such a matter novelty is not a recommendation.

Our Lord's Apostles were all men, but it does not follow that He wished no woman ever to be ordained. In the homeless days of His Ministry a woman apostle was an impossibility. But His attitude towards women was openly revolutionary. He clearly refused to accept the opinion which was then universal that women were inferior to men. The Apostles ' marvelled ' when they found Him speaking of spiritual worship to a woman of Samaria at Jacob's Well, for by so doing He was openly ignoring the social conventions of their day. In His spiritual teaching He made no distinction between women and men. He recognized the spiritual and intellectual capacities of women. He had the support of a band of women disciples, whose courage and devotion were nobly revealed on the first Good Friday. To

Mary Magdalene, their leader, He first appeared on the first Easter Day, and to her He gave the high honour of being the first messenger of His Resurrection.

In view of this evidence it is reasonable to believe that our Lord intended women to have their place in the Christian Ministry, and that He left this, as He left so many other matters, to be decided later on by His Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and in accordance with the changing conditions of succeeding generations. This belief is supported by the fact that in apostolic days the gift of prophecy was the possession of some, perhaps of many, women, who were allowed to use it for the edification of both sexes, who met together for common prayer and worship; and that the ordination of women to the diaconate may be traced back to primitive times.

The first deaconess of whom we have any knowledge is Phoebe, 'a servant (or deaconess — R.V.m.) of the church that is at Cenchreae' (*Rom.* xvi, 1). The marginal reading in the R.V. is, strictly speaking, an anachronism, and therefore slightly misleading. The word used by St. Paul was 'deacon' (διάκονος), and that is used as of common gender by our earliest authorities. The first definite instance of the use of the word deaconess (διακόνισσα) is found in the nineteenth canon of the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325).

In commenting on this verse Origen (A.D. 185—254) says it shows 'that women also were set in the ministry (διακονία) of the Church.' This was also the opinion of Bishop Lightfoot, who in his Primary Charge to the diocese of Durham said:

> 'As I read my New Testament, the female diaconate is as definite an institution as the male diaconate. Phoebe is as much a deacon as Stephen or Philip is a deacon.'

It would be unwise to lay too much stress upon this, for the conception of an 'order' was not as fixed in those very early days as it became in later times, and it seems probable that Stephen and Philip were more than deacons. The Seven are not called deacons in the *Acts*. But on the other hand the considered opinion of so great a biblical scholar as Bishop Lightfoot is not lightly to be set aside.

It can hardly be doubted that the early Greek expositors were justified in holding that I *Tim.* iii, 11, refers to women deacons,

and in that case at that uncertain but undeniably early date they evidently held a recognized place in the ministry of the Church. Pliny, in his letter to Trajan (A.D. 112), wrote of two *ministrae* who were presumably deaconesses.

From the time of Pliny's letter until about the beginning of the fourth century we know next to nothing of the ministry of women; but this gives no ground for assuming that it had ceased, for the literature of those times which has come down to us is extremely fragmentary, and Origen's words already quoted appear to imply that women deacons were known in the Church in the first half of the third century.

The '*Didascalia*,' a Syrian Church order of about A.D. 300, contains this amazing passage:

> 'The Bishop shall sit for you in the place of Almighty God. And the Deacon shall stand in the place of Christ: and ye shall love him. And the Deaconess shall be honoured by you in the place of the Holy Spirit. And the Presbyter shall be to you as a type of the Apostles.'

It would be foolish to lay stress upon anything so fantastic, but it clearly implies that in those days the deaconess held a prominent position in the ministry of the Church.

From the early part of the fourth century for at least seven hundred years we have abundant evidence of the existence of deaconesses in the East, and from the sixth century onwards we find them in the West. The Councils of Nicæa (A.D. 325) and Chalcedon (A.D. 451) legislated about them; the form for their ordination with the laying on of hands given in the '*Apostolic Constitutions*' (about A.D. 375) is precisely similar to that for the ordination of men to the diaconate, and they were clearly reckoned among the clergy.

It is a noteworthy fact that the Council of Chalcedon ordered a deaconess who had married to be far more severely punished than a virgin or monk guilty of the same offence.

> CANON XV. 'Let not a woman be ordained Deaconess before forty years of age, and that too with strict examination; but if, after she have received imposition of hands, and continued some time in her ministry, she marry, reproaching the grace of God, let such a person, together with the man united to her, be anathematized.'
>
> CANON XVI. 'It is not lawful for a virgin that has devoted herself to the Lord God, in like manner also a monk, to marry, but if they be discovered to have done so, let them be excommunicated. We decree, however, that the Bishop of the place have power of extending indulgence towards them.'

The evident reason for this notable difference in punishment is that the deaconess was in Holy Orders and the virgin and the monk were not.

The laws of Justinian make it clear that at Constantinople in the sixth century the woman deacon was regarded as being on a level with the man deacon; and in the great church of St. Sophia there were to be not more than 140 deacons, of whom forty were to be women.

Naturally the functions of women and men deacons were not identical. The chief work of women deacons was anointing women at baptism, instructing women and children, and communicating sick women with the Reserved Sacrament. But diversity of function is not inconsistent with identity of order.

As late as the eleventh century three Popes gave to the local Bishop the right of ordaining deaconesses, but not very long afterwards the only women who were ordained were certain members of the Regular Orders, and eventually the diaconate of women was allowed to lapse. There was no decision of the Church as a whole against it, and no Council of importance condemned it; but the need for it was not felt when the anointing of the whole body before baptism was given up, and the Regular Orders were absorbing nearly all the devout unmarried women.

There is no room for doubt that Professor C. H. Turner, a devout Anglo-Catholic as well as a sound scholar, was abundantly justified by the available evidence when he wrote:

> 'We may take it as admitted that the later Greek Church did ordain its deaconesses in the full sense of the word.'

This has recently been denied in an essay on '*Women and the Ministry*,' published on behalf of the Council of the Church Union, on the ground that 'it is a misuse of words to call an institution which has not maintained a constant existence in the Church, as a recognized part of the Christian ministry, a Holy Order.' But this contention is seriously weakened by the creditably frank admission 'that most Latin theologians recognize the subdiaconate as one of the *sacri ordines*, although there is universal agreement that its institution is posterior in date to the apostolic age.'

Although they were not deaconesses it is not wholly irrelevant to draw attention to the fact that some abbesses wore the

mitre, and exercised jurisdiction almost episcopal in range over the clergy. This was notably the case at Huelgas, near Burgos, where the abbesses 'possessed a full ecclesiastical jurisdiction.'

It is much nearer to the point that an anointed queen regnant at her sacring is arrayed in some of the vestments worn by a bishop, and is no longer a mere laywoman but *persona mixta*. As a woman may thus become partly a priest it seems unreasonable to contend that she is incapable of becoming wholly a deacon.

MEDITATIONS IN AN EMPTY CHURCH

By Janet Leveson Gower.

THESE meditations are written down on a June morning in an ancient church in Kent. Outside there is blinding sunshine, hot, still sunshine toasting the cut hay which lies on the grave-mounds and among the leaning, lichened headstones. Here in the church it is cool and silent. No clock ticks, but every now and then a resounding crack suggests woodwork expanding, a stirring of the church's old wooden bones.

A little staircase once went up to the roodloft, and now goes nowhere. On the wall opposite is a tablet with drapery surmounted by an urn, in memory of a younger son. *Hee dyed August 25th* 1691 *being a Young Gent of great hopes of a vertuous conversation and well inclined to serve his Country*. Below this is a small memorial to a 2nd Lieut., K.R.R.C., born 1894, killed on the Somme 1916. Beyond these is the slab-tomb of a fifteenth-century St. Leger, and over it a great hook for his helmet. Up in the corner lies another who died 'in the foelicious raigne of our present peerlesse Queene, Elizabeth.' In this north aisle Tudor windows have replaced round-headed Norman ones, traces of which still remain in the creamy plaster.

The Victorian age laid its hand heavily on the church's furnishings. Pews, hassocks, vases, have now a look in some way ghastily separate from anything in secular use. In former times church plate was of the same pattern as that used in the house whose chimneys are visible over the wall. The Tudor

linen-fold panelling in the chancel is seen again in the attics, and this low Gothic doorway is almost identical with that on the stairs at the manor. Everywhere, hall and chapel had the same vaulted or coffered roof; Wren designed a plaster wreathed ceiling for a church or a drawing-room. The old folks were at home in church, and religion was an accepted part of daily life.

All that is a long time ago now. Country life is altered beyond recognition; we have mowing machines, imported meat, and motor-vans. And it is extraordinary to think how much more I know than the St. Legers lying beside me, around me, and under my feet. But am I in effect so much wiser than they were? Death and disease are inevitable still, but they are more hidden from ordinary view than formerly. Wars and plagues swept these fields. Armed men not only rode away to foreign lands, they bled and died under a familiar wild-rose hedge. As the death-cart lumbered by it rang a bell. We have had wars in our time, but not on this soil. Physical suffering is hidden away in hospitals and carefully guarded sick-rooms. Tom's not a-cold under our window, he is tidied into an asylum. We see no gibbets, no one need fear torture. Our daily lives are sheltered, at any rate from other people's tragedies. Probably, though their religion was primitive and cluttered with folk and priestly lore, the main issues were kept clearer for the old St. Legers by their closer contact with life — and death.

There are — and probably always have been till now — two kinds of faith. One is fast dying out. It is credulous in its beginnings. It holds on to Adam and Eve, Bel and the Dragon, and rejoices in vicarious Biblical punishments. But as it grows older and has to witness or submit to unmerited distress, this faith cries out: 'Is there a God?' because its God was one who gave lollipops to good obedient children. It may be asked, whether this is a Christian faith. Where, in Christianity, is there a hint of such a God? A curious unmoral morality expecting even material reward for virtue, and apparently dependent for its guarantees on a Hebrew legend of the creation of the world, was taught to children not so long ago. The Gospels are a record of Christ's effort to free monotheism from Jewish tradition and to make morality and religious thought independent of racial history, priestly domination, and Rabbinical casuistry.

So-called Christians have been at great trouble, ever since, to replace the old fetters. In our country, perhaps, the Cromwellians and Victorians especially offended. The latter overlapped, unfortunately, with an age in which the discoveries of science seemed to undermine the very foundations of religious belief, and in the consequent reaction it seemed as if all spiritual truths were likely to go by the board, so interwoven had they become with superstition.

Nineteenth-century materialism has had its day, though it is ridden still as a hobby-horse, for political purposes, by those who would fish in troubled waters, and be leaders of the half-educated. In the same way, the orator in Battersea or Notting Dale will quote Carlyle on Revolution, ignoring all subsequent research and even events.

But there is another kind of faith, which is not incompatible with the most up-to-date scientific attitude. Is religion, as has been said, belief in what cannot be proved? Of what may we be sure? The modern scientist has given up trying to attach any sort of reality to finite space except that of a purely mental concept. Mind itself is not in space, though its existence is incontrovertible. Only minds are persons. Elementary minds and elementary forms of personality can be studied in animals and defectives. The higher the mind the more personal, individual, and influential it is. But we cannot define it or confine it, and we know no mind truly but our own. We recognize superiority, and are influenced by strength of character, not strength of body. We know that it is spiritual (not necessarily only intellectual) strength which makes most mark in the world — a strength often gained at the expense of the body. It would be absurd to inquire, who most affects to-day our intimate existence and outlook: the historical Christ or the historical Caesar, or even a legendary Christ or a legendary Jupiter. The faith which cannot be destroyed by accident is based on a recognition of our experience that the highest human development and use of life is only attained through idealism with sacrifice. Even the effort of priesthoods, down to our own times, to make religion a matter of obedience to them and of credulousness rather than of ethics and understanding, have failed to kill it. Science, in the last century, tended to do so, in the first rush of its wonder,

but as science itself develops and contradicts and supersedes itself, the secularist who has made up his mind on the subject of matter and reality is swept into a backwater, out of date. The nineteenth century was positive about what it thought it knew. The twentieth is learning faster still, and cannot be positive. Knowledge of facts only so far as we know them is not Truth. That may only come, some day, to open minds.

And what then is religion?

Benjamin Constant wrote: '*La religion est le résultat des besoins de l'âme et des effets de l'intelligence.*' And Tostoy: 'Religion is not a belief, settled once for all, in certain supernatural occurrences supposed to have taken place once upon a time, with the necessity for certain prayers or ceremonies; nor is it a survival of the superstitions of ancient ignorance which in our time has no meaning or application to life. True religion is a relation accordant with reason and contemporary knowledge, which a man establishes with the infinite life surrounding him, and it is such as binds him to that infinity and guides his conduct.'

There can be no true religion without morality (see what becomes of it in the hands of a Philip the Second, a Louis the Eleventh). And there is no true religion without activity. Zola, speaking to young men of their *fin-de-siècle* disillusionment and inertia, told them, in the meantime, till he and they saw light again, to work, as an end in itself. Only by external activity can the mind shake off a blight or bewilderment. And that blight and bewilderment has been shaken off by a large number of people in this century, who in public service have found for themselves a reason for existence and for looking forward. Ernest Dimnet (in *The Art of Thinking*) notes that many 'apparently merely devoted to an ideal of action are transformed mentally by it'; a phrase very much to be pondered.

The intelligent man in all ages wins through on to higher ground. Another may never free himself from the superstitions of his childhood, or, discarding them, will, in vacancy, betray the measure of his mind. Probably children will never be so fed on legends again, but the parent who, because he himself was credulous, denies any sort of religious teaching to his child on the plea of 'keeping its mind open' (or rather blank), is

mean, and, in judging children by himself, underrates their mentality. Only by struggle and trying to understand will understanding come. The phrase 'of an age to understand' is really meaningless, so variable is rate of growth and mental ratio. Things are understood gradually, and ability to digest knowledge depends on unforeseen circumstances — conjunction with experience, or a chance contact with another mind — accidents over which a teacher or parent has no control and of which he may even be unaware.

God is the personification of Good, as opposed to Evil. It is now the fashion to deny personality to Evil — and surely with reason. Evil dwindles downward to decay and mere filth. Good expands upwards through beauty and joy to perfection and immortality: all conceptions of the human mind, and peculiar to it. The whole trend of modern science is to exalt the human mind, more wonderful than anything we have discovered, in its perceptions, abstractions, and the possibilities of its further discoveries. The materialist must account for it as he can. Why must he explain away beauty because there is ugliness, faithfulness because there is self-interest, love because there is need of procreation? It would be as absurd as to explain away a mountain on the ground that none is visible from here (from the church porch one has a wide blue view of the Weald of Kent, pretty enough in its way), and to argue from a molehill thrown up in the meadow below. Why must the materialist be busy throwing dust in the eyes of his own reason, while there is still so much to see, so much to do, and while men of deeper learning and wider experience can keep an open mind and trust in the ultimate power of good?

Warm, rich, hay-laden air floats in at the door, swifts go whistling by in chase, out in the sunshine. Is there any truth truer in the world we know of, than that we love loveliness best, and sweetness, and peace, and remember people who believed in God?

A JAPANESE PROPHET

THE outstanding figure among contemporary Japanese authors is Toyohiko Kagawa, whose novels and poems and books on social problems have had an extraordinary sale. His first book was written with a Japanese writing-brush on sheets of old newspapers thrown away. He was too poor to buy paper. It had a sale of more than a quarter of a million copies. Some other novels have run into over 100,000 copies, and besides these he has published volumes of poems, plays, and sermons of which large editions have been repeatedly called for.

Kagawa is the greatest Christian leader in the Orient to-day, a religious and social reformer who has been compared to the Mahatma Gandhi, Saint Francis of Assisi, and Leo Tolstoy—such is his remarkable personality. An English translation of one of his greatest novels, *Towards the Dawn*, was published while he was on a visit to Europe in 1925, but it has not had a large circulation. It is autobiographical, describing his search for a satisfying faith and his attainment of spiritual peace in social service among the poorest, most wretched and degraded slum-dwellers of Kobe, the big seaport.

Kagawa was born in 1888, he son of an able bureaucrat who rose to the important post of secretary of the Japanese Privy Council. According to the custom of well-to-do Buddhist families, at the age of ten he was sent to a Buddhist temple to be taught by the priests. He went on to study the doctrines of Confucius, for the Jananese are often adherents of Shintoism, the native national religion, and of Buddhism and Confucianism as well. The exalted ethical precepts of the Chinese sage impressed the serious-minded youth, but they appeared as unattainably remote as glittering mountain peaks to a traveller foundering in valley swamps.

On his father's death Kagawa's elder brother became head of the household. A dissipated young libertine, he soon brought the family to ruin and died in poverty in Korea when Kagawa was fifteen. An uncle at Kobe took the unhappy, penniless, lonely lad into his house, and he joined a class at an American

Mission to learn English. Contact with the Christian creed transformed his fatalism into faith. The life and character revealed in the Gospels became a compelling ideal, constraining him to devote himself to the service of the lowliest.

For some years he dwelt in a ramshackle shanty, six feet by six feet, in the depths of the slums of the industrial town of Kobe, amid one of the most appalling concentrations of destitution and vice, dirt and disease on the face of the earth, which efforts inspired by Kagawa have since done much to improve. He ministered to suffering and want with sublime self-sacrifice, sometimes sharing his last bowl of rice with the starving or giving up his bed to the homeless. Outcasts, criminals, all were helped to the utmost of his resources.

Symptoms of tuberculosis appeared, caused by his exertions and privations, and the Mission sent him to live for a time in a fishing village, so that the disease might be arrested in its early stage. He was then enabled to spend three years in the United States, as a student at Princeton, and he returned to Japan an ordained minister.

He might have accepted a well-paid educational post or at least a comfortable pastorate, but he insisted upon returning to his former way of life, resuming his work for and amongst the submerged. From some miserable creature he befriended he contracted trachoma, which eventually destroyed the sight of one eye and greatly impaired the other.

All the while he was striving to fathom the causes of the misery around him, realizing poignantly that all his efforts and similar efforts were but salving a few of the myriad sores of the social organism, searching for remedies that would strike at the roots. He read widely and pondered much, especially on economic and social questions, making his own diagnosis and evolving his own methods of treatment, dismissing impatiently all theories that did not square with the actual facts as he so well knew them, and all proposals that could not be put to the proof in practical application.

The wretchedly low wages in Japan, producing malnutrition and disease and vice, aroused his indignation. Championship of the workers during a strike at the docks brought him into conflict with the authorities, who sternly forbade any assistance

being given them. He was arrested and sentenced to imprisonment, using his period in gaol to write a novel based on his slum experiences and a volume on economic problems.

After the earthquake and fire of 1923 Kagawa went to Tokio to help in relief work, living among the refugees as one of them, sharing their hardships and toiling so strenuously that his health collapsed. He recovered with eyesight nearly gone, and spent his long convalescence, while living in a little wooden house he shared with two other families, in dictating what proved to be one of his most popular novels, a story of the regeneration of character through faith.

Like Tolstoy, Kagawa employs fiction with genius as a vehicle for his religious and social teachings, and his novels by their graphic realism make a powerful appeal to his countrymen. Long queues wait at the doors of book shops on the day of publication. So with his other writings. Edition after edition has been called for of *From Star to Star*, a book of poems, and of *Before the Snowbird Awakes*, a collection of miniature dramas and reflective essays.

His sociological works have had large circulations and wide influence, his fearless and persistent agitation concerning social evils leading to large sums being expended on measures of reform. A great deal of the slum clearance and provision of better housing for the poorest carried out in recent years has been directly due to his campaign.

He is an uncompromising foe of the materialistic and communistic views which made headway among the younger men after the War, and the various labour organizations he has been instrumental in forming are not based on the doctrines of Marx. Kagawa is no revolutionary, and the so-called Socialism he preaches would be regarded here as a very moderate programme of reform.

The whole of the large profits from his books, of which more than 600,000 copies are sold annually, he devotes to his social schemes, except for very modest provision for himself, his wife and their children. At twenty-two he married a factory girl who was a voluntary worker in the Mission at Kobe, and Haru Kagawa has been active in the field of women's welfare, especially in connection with the evils of prostitution. She too has

published books, concerned specially with the needs of Japanese women and girls.

Kagawa is not only social reformer, novelist, and poet. He is an evangelist. During recent years most of his time has been absorbed by a great crusade called 'The Kingdom of God Movement,' in which Christians of all denominations are enlisted and the co-operation of all the Churches is sought. He hopes and believes that it will spread the evangel of Christian ideals and principles through all Japan.

H. PHIPPS HEMMING.

BOOK REVIEWS

EVOLUTIONARY ETHICS*

When the Bishop of Durham chose for his Gifford Lectures* the subject of Christian Morality, he had in mind the present widespread challenge to the traditional morality of Christendom. It is a challenge which he has faced squarely and answered frankly. Under Lord Gifford's will, the scope of the lectures is limited to the general subject of Natural Theology. Dr. Henson holds that his subject comes within these limits on the ground that Christian morality is the only morality which the conscience and reason of modern civilized men can approve. Christian morality is 'the morality inculcated by Jesus Christ and illustrated by His example.' It was rooted in Judaism. As Judaism became politically distintegrated, its religion became correspondingly personalized, and a truly personalized religion could not remain merely Jewish. Jesus in His ethical teaching completed the process of universalization. Rabbinism represented the old nationalism, Christianity the fruition of the universalistic tendency. The object of Christian morality was a synthesis of traditional Judaism and the teaching of Jesus.

The ethical teaching of Jesus does not constitute a legal code, and must not be treated as such.

> 'He was neither a legislator nor a casuist, and if His words be treated with the preciseness which would be proper to laws and casuistic rules, they are likely to be dangerously misunderstood and misapplied. The scandals of Christian literalism are scattered thickly throughout Christian history.'

The assumption, for example, that in His teaching about divorce Jesus laid down a law of perpetual obligation is unjustifiable, and, when acted on, has produced disastrous results. As Dr. Henson points out, 'the corruptest societies of Christendom have been those in which divorce was altogether prohibited.'

The early Christians strove to put into practice the principles enunciated by Jesus. They lived in a Graeco-Roman environment and it necessarily affected the result. The application of Christian principles does not take place in a vacuum, and, as through the centuries conditions have changed, ethical practice has been modified accordingly. Though it is true that

* *Christian Morality, Natural, Developing, Final.* By Hubert Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham. (Oxford University Press. 1936. Price 12/6 net.)

Christian morality is rooted in the past, it 'ever possesses a provisional character, and absorbs into itself new elements from an ever novel experience. It is less a finished product than something still in the making, and the factory in which it is gradually fashioned is history.' So marked has been its development that what was tolerable in the Apostolic Age may be positively repugnant to a modern Christian.

As the official formulation of Christian morality belongs to the past, it ever tends to lag behind the most enlightened Christian conscience, even so far as to create an actual breach. The timid, hesitant pronouncement of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 on the use of contraceptive methods provides a good example of official conservatism. Dr. Henson rightly lays it down that if it is to be compatible with Christian morality, it 'must serve, and not weaken self-control; strengthen, and not endanger the marriage bond; assist the due fulfilment of parenthood, not enable its repudiation; exalt family life, not destroy it.' But he displays a much bolder temper than that of the Lambeth Fathers when he says of the future that

> 'The birth of children will be controlled as never before when the interests of health in mother and infant have been intelligently considered, when the concern of the State in the physical and mental soundness of its citizens has been recognized, and when due weight has been allowed to the economic situation private and public. Irresponsible parenthood will no longer be suffered to shelter itself under religious pleas. The power of transmitting life, which of all men's spiritual endowments is the most important and the most mysterious, cannot lie outside that responsibility which Christianity interprets and emphasizes.'

As the range and colour of original Christianity were determined not only by the tradition of Judaism and the teaching of Jesus, but also by the influence of Graeco-Roman society, so its development and expression have been influenced by the very varied political, social and economic conditions which time has brought. It has proved itself adaptable. But its adaptability has been bought at a price. For instance, in its beneficent work of leavening modern industrialism, Christianity has not been able to escape a certain depravation. 'It has become perilously commercialized and infected with the cult of mundane success.' Dr. Henson goes so far as to say:

> 'My own observations during a fairly long ministry lead me to think that the financial obsessions of the Christian churches must take rank as among the major hindrances to their spiritual influence.'

He believes that we are to-day witnessing the disintegration of Industrialism. What will take its place we do not know; but he does not doubt that Christian principles will be applicable to the new conditions in the same way as to the varying conditions of the past. We shall still continue to 'learn and unlearn in the hard school of history.'

Dr. Henson devotes two lectures to the problems of Race and State. He draws a clear distinction between patriotism and the nationalism which is 'both the principle of war and the pledge of its recurrence.'

> 'Patriotism pictures humanity as a composite of many distinctive national types, enriched with the various achievements of history. Nationalism dreams of a subject world, an empire of its own wherein all men serve its interests and minister to its magnificence. Patriotism seeks association and interchange of specific qualities, pursuing the ideal of an ultimate fellowship from which shall be excluded no portion of mankind. Nationalism, pushing ever more widely its frontiers

over the earth, regards all men as the potential agents of its own selfish triumph.'

Whatever be the future of our race, it will ever require for its health three types—the Saint, the Reformer, and the Martyr. The life of Jesus was marked by personal goodness, social service, and self-sacrifice, 'the essential constituents of Christian morality.' In Him were gathered up the characteristics of the three types. Personal goodness, social service, and self-sacrifice are, Dr. Henson holds, 'integral to the moral ideal which civilized men are everywhere coming to acknowledge.' In short, Christian morality is 'the only version of religious morality which can command the acceptance of modernly civilized man.' G. L. H. HARVEY.

THE CATHOLIC GOSPEL*

This volume completes the Synoptics for the Clarendon Bible. It is a valuable book, the commentary always highly interesting, sometimes provocative, and the volume ought to be widely used not only by the school teacher, for whom the Clarendon Bibles are intended, but also by the layman and, perhaps with most profit, by the theological student. The fresh and serious treatment of its subject places it in a class apart from its companion volumes in the New Testament, which were more specifically intended for a lay audience. The Revised Text is divided up, after the arrangement of the late Prof. Bacon's *Studies in Matthew,* into the traditional number of five books, preceded by a Prologue and an Introduction (Public Life of Jesus) and concluded by an Epilogue (the Death and Resurrection). This brings out vividly the structure of the Gospel.

The chief value and interest of Canon Green's work lies in the nature of his critical approach. For him this Gospel is not only a record of the Sayings and Deeds of Jesus; not only, though much more so, narratives and sayings as the Christian communities modified, enlarged and used them; for him this Gospel contains material created over a period of some seventy years by a Christian community in which the community brings to expression its religious experience, meets its own teaching, pastoral and liturgical needs, and manifests its own ecclesiastical order and practice. There may not be agreement over all of Canon Green's opinions, but his achievement is that in a popular commentary he has moved the whole debate on to the only plane where nowadays discussion can have point and fruit, for history or religion.

The book affords release, not so much from the wearisome-enough wrangles of the recent past concerning Miracle and Order, for so long as authority maintained an impossible position based on certain texts, others had perforce to oppose it and tended rightly to choose the same ground, but release rather from the traditionalist position at large. The probability of the more highly miraculous narratives is not even discussed, and, blessedly, no attempt made to reconstruct some natural occurrences of which they might be exaggerated accounts; instead, it is tacitly assumed such narratives are no more historical in *Matthew* than it is generally agreed they are in *John,* and their origin and purpose are sought elsewhere. The one and the same type of explanation adequately accounts for the Miracles and for much of the Teaching. On this latter Canon Green is neither so radical nor so clear.

* *The Gospel according to St. Matthew,* in the Revised Version, with Introduction and Commentary. By Canon F. W. Green, M.A. (The Clarendon Bible. O.U.P., Humphrey Milford. 1936. 4/6.)

After a somewhat unnecessarily long recapitulation of past discussion of the divorce question, in which Canon Green appears over-anxious to read modern Catholic morality at all costs into his text, he sensibly concludes:

> 'It is idle, therefore, to inquire what were our Lord's actual words on the subject of divorce. As in so many other cases, all that we can say is that the weight of the evidence is in favour of the view that all that is said in the Gospels probably goes back to the single saying in Q (Lk. xvi, 18). All other sayings are expansions of or additions to that saying, and so St. Paul, who, as we have reason to believe, is the most accurate interpreter of our Lord's teaching, seems without doubt to have understood it. He has no doubt also that, within the limits laid down, the Christian Church has power to make and vary the disciplinary rules of its members in this as in all other matters (I Cor. vii, 6, 12, 25).'

The 'Rock' passage (Mt. xvi, 18), which is rightly linked for interpretation with the other *ecclesia* passage (xviii, 17), Canon Green reads as the official authorization by a Jewish-Christian Church of the principle of monarchial episcopacy, and as a looking towards its prototype in the See of Antioch, whose first Bishop had been Peter. He most interestingly claims the support of Cyprian for this exegesis:

> 'He builds His Church upon one man, and although after His resurrection He assigned equal power to all His Apostles (in the words of Jn. xx, 21-22) nevertheless, *in order that He might make manifest its unity,* He disposed the origin of that same unity as having its beginning under one man' (*De Unitate Ecclesiae,* Ch. 15).

The story of the Miraculous Feeding, whatever the event behind it, and probably it was a Messianic meal, as it appears in *Matthew* shows a church of the early second century at its Eucharist. The short essay on the Resurrection is among the best and reads inspiringly. The New Testament records form

> 'a nucleus from which the historian can still recognize the fact that certain experiences of the Risen Christ were related an an early date by eyewitnesses, many of whom were still alive in the year when I Cor. xv was written (A.D. 54). It is out of these experiences, rather than from the fact of the empty Tomb, that the belief in the Resurrection arose. What, then, was the nature of the appearances? The Resurrection of Jesus Christ is never in the New Testament regarded as a case of mere survival after death. Nor were (the Appearances) anything in the nature of a mystical vision. The Easter experiences happened simultaneously to a number of persons, and within a measurable interval suddenly came to an end. As we have already seen, the Resurrection is always regarded in the New Testament as an eschatological event, closely connected with the Kingdom of God, and that of Jesus is never spoken of apart from the Resurrection of the dead as a whole. To judge from the interpretation of St. Paul, the Resurrection appearances were to the disciples an experience in some overwhelmingly convincing form of an act of the Living God, which they felt to have been the fulfilment of all the prophetic and apocalyptic revelations of the past. It was the dawn of the age to come and of the new life in the Spirit of which Christ Himself was the "first-fruits." "The miracle of Easter," as a recent writer remarks, "is not the fact of the Easter visions nor the empty grave, but the act of the living God 'who

raised up Jesus from the dead,' summoning man, soul and body, from death to life in the Spirit. In the Easter fact the final end of history enters in some way into history.'' When the primitive Church went out into the world with the message "the Lord is Risen,'' it was not only the Easter events that it preached, but the *act of God* which lies behind them and which, as St. Paul says, is still operative in the Christian Church (Rom. viii, 11; Eph. i, 19-20).' [Quoted from pp. 258-260.]

We could wish Canon Green had spoken as plainly about the story of the Virgin Birth. A careful re-reading of his comment leaves still the impression that he has altogether evaded the issue, and with it what would seem to be the obvious conclusion for one with his method of approach. His position is disturbingly revealed in a footnote to p. 236, when, in referring to the Fourth Gospel, he speaks of 'that disciple who took the Virgin to his own home.' He is apparently determined to hold the belief despite his own general view of the first chapters of *Matthew*; and he ignores the silence of the Fourth Gospel.

Canon Green dates *Matthew's* setting in the latter half of the reign of Domitian, and thus he places the final compiling some fifteen years later than the usual dating. He argues from its tone, which does not suggest a church suffering persecution, and from its close affinities, in this and other matters, with the Pastoral and General Epistles, and with *Revelation* i-iii. Throughout the Commentary he makes illuminating references to the later Epistles and to the Apocryphal Gospels. The birth-place of the book he thinks to have been North and North-East Syria, with Edessa as the most likely town. The suggestion fits the 'Synagogue Greek,' of the First Gospel and the 'Haggadic' features of the matter peculiar to it which, following Bacon, the author terms *N*. It is the official Gospel of a Jewish-Christian community which treasured the law but yet accepted the universal character of the Christian Mission. Because Canon Green somewhat overstresses the 'massive unity' of the book, he is not happy with the 'isolationist' passages, such as x, 5 (*Go not into any way of the Gentiles,* etc.); he tends to the opinion that x, 5 was a counsel given by Jesus at the Last Supper to the effect that the Disciples should remain in or near Jerusalem until the Parousia. And while he acknowledges there was an eschatological element in the teaching of Jesus, and considers it to have been originally more prominent than now appears in any of the Gospels, he only refers to, and does not discuss, Schweitzer's interpretation of x, 23, and himself suggests the verse means Jesus to say that after the flight from Jerusalem the Son of Man would return and re-establish the Holy City before the Disciples had exhausted the cities of Israel as places of refuge. Yet Canon Green takes 'Son of Man' in the Gospels as referring to an Apocalyptic Heavenly Being.

For Canon Green the main characteristics of this Gospel are its interest in eschatology and judgment, and the influence of liturgical usage upon its form, the latter very evident in the Passion Narrative.

> 'Matthew's stately periods and diction were clearly intended to be used in Christian meetings for worship under the presidency of the Bishop and his Presbyters' (p. 3).

The other main characteristic is

> 'that Matthew represents the movement towards *Catholicism* in the early Church — that is to say, it represents a reaction from 'the freedom of the Spirit' — in the direction of something far more clearly defined in Church doctrine and order' (p. 2).

Matthew is interested

> 'especially in the regulation and discipline of the Church through its heirarchy, of which St. Peter as Vicar of Christ upon earth is the divinely appointed Head: its sacramental system and authority in faith and morals' (p. 7).

Canon Green's note on the prominence given to Peter in this Gospel is convincing, but in our view he too often assumes without sufficient evidence this background of an advanced Church order, of a monarchial Bishop and his Presbyters, and sometimes quite gratuitously, as in his sentence quoted above from p. 3. Matthew is throughout *Ecclesiastical,* but by no means consistently *Episcopalian.* Canon Green has hardly allowed for what seems to be the fact, that while there are many passages which suggest monarchial episcopacy to be already the recognized order, passages which may be the work of the final editor, these are isolated and even contradictory of their context and of the bulk of the Gospel. For instance, Canon Green holds that xviii, 18 (*cf.* xvi, 19, *What things soever ye shall bind,* etc.), which he does not regard as a Saying of Jesus, refers to

> 'excommunication and reconciliation, always carried out in the primitive Church by the Bishop only' (p. 215).

This may well be so, but he does not notice that this verse stands awkwardly in a section markedly *congregational* in tone. Indeed, he comments:

> 'After the enactment of the procedure for the treatment of sins of Church members by Church officers, Mt. interpolates from an unknown source the saying about corporate prayer, verse 19' (p. 214).

But what is enacted is that a brother shall first seek out an offending brother privately and 'shew him his fault,' then if necessary before two or three witnesses. There follows the awkward verse, with its weak sutures, probably enough referring to a Bishop's function. Canon Green's 'corporate prayer' amounts to agreement about their request by two Christians (xviii, 19), and the section concludes, '*For where two or three are gathered together in My name,*' etc., which is surely the proof-text of all who would oppose an organised ecclesiasticism become formal and authoritative by the religion of the Spirit. The probability would seem to be that xviii, 18, is an episcopalian interpolation into earlier teaching of a congregational type.

It is doubtful if the beginner in these studies, for whom the Clarendon Bibles are primarily intended, will realise the full import of all Canon Green says, and we think this a pity. Plain reminders on important passages, of what has been rejected, particularly concerning the miracles, would have helped greatly, for it is just what Canon Green rejects that fills and confuses the lay mind to-day. It would have helped also if the clear and cautious note on Form Criticism had come at the very beginning instead of at the very end of the book. There is not sufficient attention given to Matthew's use of *Mark,* nor to his departures from it, and in particular to the serious declension in *Matthew* from the standard of inherent probability in *Mark,* especially in the Passion Narrative, where only the rending of the Temple Veil mars the majestic simplicity of the Marcan realism. While Canon Green is free and stimulating in his treatment of what is peculiar to *Matthew* as, in its final form, the work of a creative community, he does not discuss the serious issue raised when we find analogous forms in passages where Matthew is dependent on Mark or Q. In such passages, for a critic with his views, he seems over concerned with the question

of their Dominical authority. His whole position about the words of Jesus is not without ambiguity.

> 'While therefore it is obvious that the vast majority of the sayings collected in the Synoptic Gospels are the actual words of Jesus translated into Greek, there is no need to question the considered judgment of the conservative scholar Schlatter, who has analysed the sayings of Jesus in Matthew with a minuteness which no one else has attempted:
>
> '"We have no Sayings of Jesus which have not come down to us other than under the supervision of the original Christian Community which believed them to be the Sayings of a divine Person. Behind that framework we cannot get. The evidence fails us"' (p. 265).

Many of his comments are more faithful to his own words at the head of this quotation than to the burden of Schlatter's axiom. Again, he appears to hold that most of the Sayings which are not the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus are post-Resurrection Sayings, or 'Sayings of the Spirit': he does not distinguish between these. It is important to observe, both for criticism and for an understanding of the Resurrection narratives, that neither Canon Green nor the Evangelists make any distinction between the authority of such Sayings received during the short period in which, Canon Green points out, the Appearances may be gathered to have taken place, and the authority of those received much later. The hypothesis of post-Resurrectional sayings must indeed, as for many of the Sayings, prove but a half-way house, as in one instance Canon Green himself declares:

> 'From that position (of regarding xvi, 18-19 as 'Sayings of the Risen One') it is only a step to that of Bultmann, who regards them as an utterance of the primitive community of Palestine placed in the mouth of the Risen Lord' (p. 208).

And surely under the view of the New Testament taken by this Commentary on the whole, it is no longer possible to refer from the Gospels to *Acts* as a source wherein 'Peter elsewhere himself declares' on the point at issue (p. 205)? If the Gospels are to be read as to any extent the constructions of a community or of a writer, most evidently the early chapters of *Acts* must so be read.

A most useful feature of this volume is its numerous and telling quotations from previous Commentaries, Protestant and Roman, and from a wide field of general literature on the New Testament, both English and German. The pictures interspersed in the text are not always apposite, and in a work of this weight are a little irritating. The type is very good. There are one or two misprints: *Bulttman* (p. 208), *spurpose* (p. 4), and *Mt.* for Mk. in an important sentence on p. 18. M.T.D.

DIVINE GUIDANCE AND PERSONAL EXPERIENCE*

'Guide me, O thou great Redeemer,' has been sung in our churches ever since the eighteenth century, when the hymn was composed by W. Williams (1717-91). 'Guidance' is now stressed by the Groups as a new experience, even as a new dogma with its own technical method. Mr. W. J. Noble in his little book entitled *Guidance** gives us an outline of the doctrine and some general principles regarding it. He compares 'guidance' in the Old and New Testaments thus:

> 'It is very interesting to observe that there is much less that is, as

* *Guidance.* By W. J. Noble. (S.C.M., 1936, 1/- net.)
* *A Method of Prayer.* By the Rev. H. W. Fox. (S.C.M., 1934. Price 2/-.)

it were, detailed and specific about guidance in the New Testament than there is in the Old. And yet the fact of guidance strikes one far more forcibly than in the earlier book. The reason seems to be that there is so much deeper and more intimate a sense of God's nearness to man in Christ. There is the offer of a divine companionship, first given to the disciples and subsequently made the privilege of all believers. And this companionship is so natural and universal an offer that the experience of it obviates the necessity for detailed reference to particular guidance' (p. 12*f.*).

The following are some principles which Mr. Noble enunciates for a 'guided' life:

'We cannot dispense, except to our loss, with the garnered knowledge of the ages. That is a form of spiritual arrogance which will assuredly bring its own humiliating punishment.'

'It needs constantly to be kept in mind that there is a vast quantity of subjects on which no Christian needs, or has the right to look for, special guidance at all. The New Testament draws a certain plain line of demarcation. It is expressed with the greatest clearness by St. Paul.'

'To expect to receive guidance when we are living, and are content to live, in the power of any known sin, is to deny and contradict the fundamental conditions of the Christian life.'

'The full, continual and unequivocal surrender of our whole being to God is the inescapable condition of our receiving His guidance in daily life.'

Mr. Noble gives some good advice to those young religious enthusiasts who feel that they are greater than their fellows in gifts and graces and long for a sphere from which their light shall shine forth on a naughty world:

'It behoves us to examine with scrupulous care the credentials of any "guidance" which has the effect of taking us away from the place, say, in the Church which we occupy, and the work we are now doing, and which has hitherto seemed to us to be in the clear and unmistakable line of duty.

Life grows, experience develops, opportunity broadens out for the faithful servant of God. He calls His children from one task to another, from a smaller (as we say) to a greater. But here is a fact that has innumerable verifications. If we are seeking to know and to do the will of God, experience shows that changes of that kind almost never come from our own volition. They come from causes strictly outside ourselves, through which the will of God operates. But if we start them within our own unstable and restless hearts (whatever language we use to persuade ourselves that we are following God's call) they are suspect' (p 28*f.*).

Mr. Noble speaks words of wisdom about cultivating an enlightened conscience, the perils of self-deception, the necessity of using our reasoning faculties and developing our power of a right judgment in all things:

'God looks to us to use all these factors to the full, and not to look for a special revelation from heaven on every decision we have to make. We are not marionettes, dangling and dancing at the end of a string as God pulls. We are not automata, or robots, blindly obeying certain impulses communicated to us from without. We are sons and daughters of a God Who looks to us for growth in wisdom, and in the power to see and to apply the principles of truth to our life' (p. 36).

The Rev. H. W. Fox, author of *The Child's Approach to Religion, Tales from the Old Testament,* has written *A Method of Prayer,* based in part upon Madam Guyon's *A Short and Easy Method of Prayer.* Mr. Fox relates how, unsuccessful in her search for God, Madame Guyon went to an old Franciscan, who told her to look into her own heart where she would find God. From that moment Madam Guyon found guidance for all her actions by communion with God—the watching and waiting for the direct working of God in her own heart. But, as the following quotation shows, her condition of getting guidance, in spite of the word 'only,' is not an easy one :

> 'It is only necessary to go to prayer with courage and such a pure, disinterested love as seeks nothing from God but the ability to please Him and to do His Will' (p. 19).

Would the Oxford Groups, who agree with Madame Guyon on Guidance, be equally pleased with her remarks on Confession?

> 'Nor should the soul be ashamed if it forgets its sins and if it finds it hard to remember them. Let this cause no uneasiness, because this forgetfulness is a mark of our being freed from them, and it is the best thing to forget all that concerns ourselves and only to remember God. Moreover, God never fails to make us see our greatest faults, when confession is our duty, for it is He then that makes His own examination, and we shall see that it comes better in this way than by all efforts of our own' (p. 20).

The question 'What is Prayer?' Mr. Fox answers by the title of a well-known little book, *The Practice of the Presence of God.* From Dr. Streeter's book *The Buddha and the Christ* Mr. Fox gives the following quotation :

> 'Prayer becomes a means to the realisation of a relation of man to the Unseen, from out of which grows a confidence in the love of God and in His readiness to guide and strengthen that can lay aside all anxiety for the morrow, brave its worst possibilities, and react aright to all contingencies.'

Mr. Fox argues that God's Kingdom will come on earth just 'in so far as men choose to allow the Divine presence within them to fulfil His purpose through them.' Further, he states that :

> 'The soul that experiences this union with God to-day continues that union unbroken when it has passed from the body.'
>
> 'God being within us, we cannot die, for He is the Living God.'

Chapter v ends with some notable thoughts :

> 'Christian prayer as the condition of moral genius; worship (in Emerson's phrase) "in some manner the source of intellect"; fellowship with the Creator and Redeemer of men the means of "overcoming the world" and "moulding it closer to the heart's desire" . . . the theory fits the world situation exactly; it needs to be put into practice.'

At the end of his book Mr. Fox makes some practical suggestions with regard to the attitude of mind and body in prayer, and there is a useful appendix of matter for silent prayer. We conclude this review with one more of Mr. Fox's quotations from Madam Guyon :

> 'Go then to prayer, not to wish to enjoy God, but to be as He wishes.'

M. E. Major.

TIMID DIVORCE REFORM*

No living man has had as much experience of divorce cases in court as Lord Merrivale, who from 1919 to 1933 held the great office of President of the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division of the High Court. But, as this small book clearly shows, the Bench sees only part of a problem. Cases in the Divorce Court are investigated from one angle only. Solicitors and social workers, especially Probation Officers, see far more of matrimonial problems than do those on the Bench. Thus Lord Merrivale writes that 'the notion that a spouse conjugally faithful will break out into acts of real cruelty is hard to conceive,' but what solicitor or social worker would confirm this statement? Even a magistrate, who also suffers from the limitations of the judicial position, knows enough of the lives of others to know that serious cruelty frequently exists without any suggestion of adultery.

Lord Merrivale's attitude to the divorce problem is very like that of the leaders of the Church of England. 'Opinion in the religious world about divorce does not easily change,' writes Lord Merrivale, and the same can be truly said of himself. But happily the Church of England does change, and so does Lord Merrivale, but the Church has gone further than he has. Even the majority report of last year's Convocation Committee was a more advanced work than this book. When at the end of the book Lord Merrivale comes to handle the actual proposals of the majority Commissioners of 1912 he is full of doubts and criticisms. One has a feeling that but for two factors Lord Merrivale would rather not have any divorce reform at all. Those factors are the change in the official attitude of the Church of England and, secondly, the ugly fact that, in his own words, 'as things are, divorce by arrangement is easily brought about by unscrupulous persons.' Nobody knows this last fact better than Lord Merrivale. On the Bench he strove hard to prevent collusion, but his efforts in this direction were far from successful. 'Unscrupulous persons' continued in their ways, and from the religious and moral point of view it may be doubted whether a stage-managed appearance of adultery is not better than the real thing.

There will be full sympathy with Lord Merrivale when he points out the dangers of loose standards about marriage and that the 'large proportion' of married people regard divorce 'with concern, if not with loathing.' Reasonable happiness is far more prevalent in marriage than acute unhappiness, and no reasonable person wants any 'tampering with the foundations.' But Lord Gorell, the chairman of the Royal Commission of 1912, came much nearer than does Lord Merrivale to a practical policy whereunder relief for the acutely unhappy can be granted without tampering with our Christian foundations. The words of Lord Gorell quoted on p. 47 of this book cannot be bettered: divorce is 'a matter of civil polity to be settled under the control of the great principles laid down by Christ on grounds of expediency in relation to the present circumstances of the people and with due regard for the conscientious difficulties of the minority.'

Lord Merrivale reveals a strange longing for a return to penalties for adultery: 'Why should a man who breaks up the home of another escape the proper consequences of criminous misconduct?' One may well doubt whether even the revival of the civil action for enticement, which has happened since Lord Merrivale left the Bench, has been to the public advantage. Criminal proceedings would effect no improvement. Another strange

* *Marriage and Divorce, the English Point of View.* By Lord Merrivale. (Allen and Unwin. 1936. 2/6.)

feature of this book is the author's advocacy of procedure that would not unfairly be described as humbug. On the one hand Lord Merrivale writes that to treat nullity 'as an expedient of divorce — as was said to be done overseas during the ages when divorce as such was unknown there—is no doubt a degradation rather than an exaltation of the marital relationship.' That is profoundly true. Both marriage and law are brought into contempt when subterfuge is resorted to. But what can be said of Lord Merrivale's own suggestions that deserting spouses should be 'declared civilly dead' and that the same procedure should be applied to persons sentenced to death or life imprisonment? Subterfuges to avoid divorce are surely worse than open divorce.

One could wish that Lord Merrivale had developed further his argument for making marriage more difficult and public. Practical proposals are badly needed here, and if enacted would do much good. One could wish also that he had tackled the question whether, as is proposed in Mr. A. P. Herbert's present Bill, the procedure for investigation and reconciliation now existing in courts of summary jurisdiction (soon to be greatly improved largely owing to the efforts of Lord Merrivale himself) cannot be adapted to the Poor Persons' Divorce. By some such method many divorces would be prevented and other and better solutions found. Lord Merrivale gives the figures of Poor Persons' divorces and is apparently satisfied with the working of the Rules, which he describes as 'fully effective.' I cannot agree at all. The Rules are not effective for the really poor, especially outside London, and they do not provide for any social investigation or help. Only by linking up the High Court and the 'Police Court' can a Poor Persons' procedure be made fully adequate. This is a matter on which Lord Merrivale could render very great assistance.

CLAUDE MULLINS.

SONGS OF ZION *

Mr. Lionel James has performed a useful service to religious worship by producing his little book on the Psalms. In this volume he arranges the Psalms in groups with other Old Testament lyrics, with short introductions, glossary and notes. He wisely makes use of the Prayer Book version. Mr. Lionel James contributes, in addition, informative notes on Hymns based on the Psalms, the influence of the Psalms on English Poetry, Christ's use of the Psalms, Personification in the Psalms, and Life in Palestine as pictured in the Psalms. Modernists will find not least interesting Mr. Lionel James' plea for the exclusion of the 'Enemy Psalms' from Christian worship. He deals as follows with the specious plea, 'We read in our services stories of Jewish ferocity in war, why should we not sing their ferocious war songs?':

> '*Reading* and *singing* are very different things. When we sing, we identify ourselves, or at the lowest *tend* to identify ourselves, with the writer of the words, and to make his words our own. If we did *not* apply the thoughts and aspirations of the Psalms to ourselves, there would be no point in singing them. True, in Oratorio—the *Elijah,* for example — a chorus representing priests of Baal may give voice to sentiments appropriate to such priests, but not to Christians, or in the *Christus,* representing the Jewish mob, may clamour 'Crucify him'; but Oratorio is recognized as drama in music. With the Psalms it is different. They are not *dramatic* poetry, but *lyric.* The whole case for singing them is that they are religious lyrics of a markedly

* *Songs of Zion.* By Lionel James. (Pub. John Murray. School Edition. 1936. Price 5/-.)

personal character; and it is just because in the main they voice so perfectly our inmost thoughts and aspirations that we make them part of our daily worship. But that is no reason why those exceptional psalms which, instead of expressing our highest feelings, give utterance to our lowest, should be included in our services. Even if we learn *not,* in these cases, to identify ourselves with the writers, it is demoralizing to dwell on expressions, however poetical, of the desire for revenge.'

This volume, which its author regards as intended for the plain man who has learnt to love the Psalms, he very appropriately dedicates to Rowland Prothero, Lord Ernle, 'to whose *Psalms in Human Life* all lovers of the Psalms owe the tribute of sincerest admiration and gratitude.'

H.D.A.M.

IN THE FULNESS OF TIME*

This book is the publication of a course of public lectures, delivered in the University of Leeds, on the historical background of Christianity, designed for those who

> 'want to know something about the world in which Christianity arose and the place it occupied in that world; how the one reacted upon the other; in what respects the Christian Faith can be regarded as the product of its environment; and how far it cannot be explained from its historical background' (p. vi).

It has a usefulness and interest incommensurate with its size (174 pages), for in it Prof. James has stored, while developing the theme indicated by the title, admirable historical summaries together with some authoritative accounts of representative mystery religions of the Graeco-Roman world.

The first three chapters illustrate the claim that Christ was born in the 'fulness of time' from two points of view, that of the Graeco-Roman world and that of the Jewish world. At the time of the birth of Jesus

> 'the indigenous worship of Rome had been overlaid by Greek mythological systems; exotic cults from Egypt and Phrygia found eager adherents, but their appeal was almost entirely emotional; philosophy had spent its force in a world weary of intellectual enlightenment . . .' (p. 19).

Nevertheless,

> 'Without these cults it is difficult to understand how the way could have been prepared for the acceptance of the Faith which centred in the death and resurrection of Christ, and all that flowed therefrom' (p. 42).

Judaism, intellectually ready for the fulfilment of its hopes, was, 'however, at the beginning of the Christian era . . . really a spent force religiously as well as politically' (p. 63).

The chapter on *The Christ* reviews some important modern theories about Jesus and reveals a strongly positive and reasoned attitude to Him on the part of the author. One conclusion is that

> 'As far back as we can reach by a literary criticism of the forms in which ideas, thoughts, reports, and descriptions were passed on orally or in writing, Jesus was worshipped as Lord (*Kyrios*)' (p. 74).

* *In the Fulness of Time.* By E. O. James, D.Litt., Ph.D., F.S.A. (S.P.C.K. 1935. 4/-.)

This conviction of the author is of the greatest importance for the following chapter on *St. Paul and the Apostolic Church,* the chapter which is the natural pivot of a book which describes not only the situation which awaited our Lord but that which arose as the result of His coming. This is perhaps the best part of an excellent book. Prof. James defines clearly the difference between St. Paul and the other Apostles: while of St. Paul he claims that 'behind his apologetic lay the teaching of the first generation of the Church' he states also the fact that

> 'unlike them he had not known Jesus in the flesh, and while they found it hard to visualise their Master as the risen and exalted Saviour of mankind, his problem was to equate the triumphant Son of Man with the Jesus of Nazareth' (p. 94).

It is further pointed out that the upbringing of St. Paul, and his environment at the time of his conversion, suggested a wider outlook than that of the other Apostles; and his very conversion, bound up as it was with his witness of Stephen's death, made his first knowledge of Christ knowledge of a universal Christ. But Prof. James does not believe that the Gospel underwent any radical change in its treatment by St. Paul. He makes clear the value of the training of the Gentile world through mystery cults without supposing that St. Paul intended to commend Christianity as yet another mystery religion, and as illustration gives a list of differences between the purpose of initiation in the pagan mysteries and that of baptism into Christianity. (There is, in the Graeco-Roman system, no trace, for example, of a 'gift of the spirit.') What he says of St. Paul's teaching about immortality may be quoted as expressing his position about other aspects of the faith: St. Paul, he claims, 'adopts a distinctively Christian position expressed in terms designed to commend the Easter Faith in a Gentile environment' (p. 105).

The book is concluded by two very interesting chapters on *Councils, Creeds and Cults* and *Christian Civilization.* The author's tolerant attitude towards the conciliar period does not prevent the reader experiencing once again the suspicion that this period was marked by an almost universal degeneration of the human mind. Although it may be true that the church's 'first duty in the fourth century was to establish her conception of God and of His relation to the universe and mankind' (p. 135), it cannot be said as truly that she established this conception wisely or charitably. Prof. James' own conclusion, one with which many will agree, about the Chalcedonian formula is that

> 'because the Chalcedonian Fathers were content to enunciate a definition, they supplied a permanent basis for the Faith which has endured throughout the ages. It is only when such definitions are regarded as infallible that they have a cramping effect on subsequent thought and defeat their own ends' (pp. 148-9).

The lack of charity which has been displayed by the Church since her alliance with the state is not the only weakness which has befallen her since that time: the final chapter is a useful summary of the steps by which Christianity grew and took on genuinely new features — and therefore makes clear the relevance of these two final chapters as connecting the main subject of the book with our own situation — and it reveals that some of these new features were incompatible with the church's ancient rigidity in constitution and doctrine. For example, the alliance between Leo and Charlemagne created at the same time a rivalry which finally dislodged the papacy from its pre-eminence, except over Latin Christendom. Similarly,

in the sphere of thought, the alliance made by Aquinas himself between the theology of revelation and the philosophy of Aristotle held the germ, in the famous distinction between truths of revelation and truths of natural reason, of that movement of free enquiry which eventually swept away (again except from Latin Christendom) Aquinas' own once absolute pre-eminence. Consequently,

> 'To-day the ideas of progress and material prosperity have become dissociated from the inspiration of faith and lost their controlling unity' (p. 173).

And Prof. James urges that

> 'While actually history never repeats itself, there is more than a superficial resemblance between the present age and the period which witnessed the decline and disruption of the Gracco-Roman Empire. Then as now civilization had grown weary and required revitalizing' (pp. 173-4).
>
> 'But' (the book concludes) '"Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," and if sound spiritual foundations are to be laid at the beginning of this new era, when society is in grave danger of falling a victim to its own inherent disruptive forces, Christian values must be given their full significance. For then, and only then, will "the kingdoms of the world become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ," and progressive civilization achieve its true end.'

It seems that the emphasis is on the word 'Christian' and the conclusion which one draws from these last two chapters is that the church puissant has lost its grip on Christian values and is therefore losing its power. The moral is well pointed even though the author points it unconsciously, his object being to show not the weakness of the church but that of society. Since it has also appeared from this book that the alliance of church and state has proved detrimental to the church, we are bound to wonder, as indeed so many people are already wondering, what the right relation of the church to secular society can be.

A. R. C. Leaney.

BIBLE READING AND TEACHING*

The Bible at the present time seems to be bought by more and read by fewer people than ever before. The sales of the British and Foreign Bible Society increase every year. A hospital, to raise money, recently advertised a leatherbound cut-price edition. Mr. Sheen, in his book, has a story of a London journalist going to Palestine and reading his Bible on the boat to refresh his memory. A fellow-passenger came up to him and asked him if he were a missionary, as he read his Bible so often.

It is possible that the stage of scepticism which we are at present going through, in Europe at any rate, is only temporary: that if we who teach persevere in an exposition of a reasonable view of the Bible, we shall be able to restore it to its former position. But in order to do that we must obviously teach on the right lines. It is absurd to assume, as some still do, that we can teach that all parts of the Bible are equally valuable. We shall have to convince most people that we, who regard the Bible as evidence for Christianity, to be examined as all other historical evidence is examined,

* *What do you know of the Bible?* By the Rev. H. E. Sheen. (Skeffington. 6/-.) *The Roots of Religion and the Old Testament.* By C. H. S. Matthews. (Student Christian Movement Press. 2/6.)

think just as much of the Bible as the verbal-inspirationists. We cannot always convince them that the Bible comes out of the test of historical criticism better than any other document, because to be convinced of that needs a good deal of solid work. There is no doubt that hard work is needed to read the Bible nowadays, and the time-honoured rule of a chapter a day, read by itself, is both inadequate and confusing.

Of these two books, that by the Chaplain of Marlborough College is a reproduction of lessons on the Old Testament given to the highest forms at a Preparatory School and in the lowest forms at Marlborough. Mr. Matthews has hit upon the brilliant idea of making use of the primitive instincts of schoolboys of this age to throw light upon the earlier stages of Jewish religion: just as the young savages of our day grow into enlightened adults, so he traces the gradual enlightenment of the Jewish people in the ways of Jehovah, the will of God. Taught in this way, there will be no talk of Old Testament lessons being dull or a waste of time. He has some wise words on verbal inspiration, and on bibliolatry. He hastens to expose what has been called the fallacy of the 'nothing but'; the idea that because religion has grown from crude beginnings, it must be something that the developed and civilized man can grow out of. He has an intriguing diagram (p. 57) of the religious progress of the Jewish people, representing it as a series of mountain peaks. Following out this analogy, we shall always, at any given age, find many who have remained at the lower levels of religious thought. Their lower ideas of God will only serve to set off the thought and revelation of the great prophets. Mr. Matthews concludes with a brief treatment of the teaching of these, particularly of Amos and Hosea, and the story of Jonah. Those who grumble at a bowdlerized version of Hosea's message should remember those to whom the contents of the book were first addressed. Boys of fourteen are not, on the whole, interested in marital infidelities.

The whole book is most attractively planned and carried out, and should be welcomed by all parents and teachers who are willing and allowed to get away from those generally unimportant persons, the kings of Judah and Israel.

Mr. Sheen's book is planned with a similar object. A foreword by Canon Peter Green vouches for the author's

> 'power of exposition and how he can take wide views of a large and difficult subject without ever losing sight of the important details, and without indulging in mere vague generalities.'

The sub-title of the book is, *Being simple studies for ordinary folk on subjects of interest and importance concerning Holy Scriptures*. The matter of the book has, Mr. Sheen says, been contained in sermons preached over a considerable period, and the style not infrequently reminds his reader of this.

The book is divided into four parts. The first is called 'The Hope of the Ages' (the relevance of the title is not obvious) and follows much the same lines as the book just examined, tracing the progressive revelation of God to the Jewish people, from the days when their ideas on the subject of God were very little different from those of their neighbours, to its culmination in Jesus Christ. The treatment is, in view of the small scale adopted (forty pages), sound and adequate. The second part is headed 'The Old Testament Scriptures,' and consists of chapters dealing with the composition of the books, the selection and preservation of the canon, and a 'bird's-eye view of history' as set forth by Old Testament and Apochrypha from the Creation of the world to the birth of Christ.

The third part consists of six chapters, or sermons, on New Testament subjects, of a sort which most clergy are accustomed to preach but not all to publish. Much of it was hardly worth including in the book. Too much space is given to the traditions, probably quite valueless, about the subsequent fates of the Twelve, and to the identification of the rich young ruler, who went away sorrowful, as St. Barnabas. There is a plentiful supply of other pious conjecture generally unsupported by evidence, an unnecessary sneer at 'Modernists' on p. 96, and some unconvincing and unnecessary attempts to rationalize the details of the Resurrection appearances on pp. 103-105. Throughout, the author treats the theories which he considers most probable as if they were facts, and ignores others. Spatial limitations will of course account for some of this, but it is a dangerous form of exposition.

The fourth part is seven chapters on 'The Witness of the Early Church.' They differ in value, and for the most part adopt an extreme conservative standpoint, with a somewhat irritating dogmatism, and the apparent acceptance of more worthless traditions, like that of St. Paul's visit to England, and that on his death 'a liquor more like milk than blood flowed from his veins and spurted upon the clothes of the executioner'; or that, according to others, the apostle John was cast by Domitian into a cauldron of boiling oil, and being preserved from death therein, was exiled to Patmos, where he wrote the Apocalypse.

The book is disfigured by a number of careless mistakes and misprints, particularly in the second half. On p. 128 'Quella' appears for '*Quelle*'; on p. 143 a bracket begins but never ends, and the same mistake occurs again on p. 184. The orthodox grammarian has discovered two split infinitives, on pp. 64 and 202. On p. 168 Hermas should be *Hermes*; on p. 183 *Aggrippa* is so mis-spelt, and followed by the correct spelling on the next line. On p. 184 'the' appears for 'then'; on p. 186 Paterson Smyth's name is mis-spelt. On p. 198 '*de fides*' appears. On p. 205 'countryman' should, it seems, be 'countrymen.'

W. H. Oldaker.

THE CHURCH FROM TWO ANGLES*

Frau Schaefer, reared a Protestant, became an unbeliever, but her interest in religion induced her to attend the World Conference of Life and Work at Stockholm in 1925. The result may be given in her own words:

> 'It was there that a new world revealed itself to me. I saw the reality and the force of religious ideas in the world for the first time, and I felt happy to be a member of the Christian community. Of Catholicism I had not the slightest understanding, though I delighted in the beautiful ritual of the services, but thought them to be something external. My deepest impression, nevertheless, I got attending an Anglican service of the Holy Eucharist; I did not at all know what it meant, but there was such a devout and quiet atmosphere in the church. A monk was the celebrant; what did that mean, a monk who was not a Roman? It was all so strange and embarrassing for me: I did not dare to move. At last they walked up to the altar and all those proud prelates at the conference knelt down humbly at the rails. I never forgot this scene.'

Thus impressed, Frau Schaefer on her return to Germany began to study theology at Marburg, where she came to know Professor Heiler and

* *The Catholic Regeneration of the Church of England.* By Paula Schaefer. (Williams and Norgate. 1936. 10/6.)

The Church Catholic. By Nathaniel Micklem, D.D. (S.C.M. 1936. 1/6.)

his aims, and also heard the lectures of Rudolf Otto. At the same time she found 'the proofs that the New Testament is a Catholic document and that, therefore, the true Christian religion has to be a Catholic one.' But the Roman Church did not attract her, and she came to England to study Anglicanism, and found there her spiritual home. The volume before us is a work as it were of filial piety:

> 'I wished to show to my dear German people how a Church can be really Catholic and really national at once, really evangelical in the sense of the Holy Scriptures and also possessing the full Catholic sacraments.'

Although the standpoint of the author will doubtless seem to an Anglican born and bred a trifle naïve, and her standpoint a little uncritical (her reading, as revealed both in the text and the bibliography, having been chiefly in authorities of the type of Gore, Darwell Stone, Sidney Dark, T. A. Lacey, and so forth), yet her book is of interest and value. Especially is this so because Frau Schaefer has an acquaintance with Continental conditions which enables her to take a less provincial view of religion than that of one whose range of vision does not pass beyond the landscape visible from the top of the Radcliffe Camera. She regards the Ecclesia Anglicana as 'the natural and providentially provided intermediary in the great work of bringing the forces of Christianity nearer to one another and into a final union.' May it indeed prove to be so.

Dr. Nathaniel Micklem's lectures are inspired by a not dissimilar ideal—that of a reunited Church, though he approaches his subject by a different road, and his standpoint is more objectively historical and realistic. The need of some kind of effective collaboration on the part of the Churches is indeed urgent.

> 'The whole Christian enterprise on the mission field, on the international stage, and in this country is held up by smallness of mind and sectarianism of spirit.'

Dr. Micklem would not be satisfied with 'a vague, occasional, consultative federation of Christian fellowships and communions'; this sort of thing is not good enough. But he recognises that Apollyon bestraddles the path in the form of the divine right of episcopacy. Dr. Micklem makes his attitude here quite clear: he is no intransigent, but he is alive to, and accepts, the facts of history, as well as those of to-day:

> 'I believe that we are called to recognise again and to reaffirm that it was according to the will of God and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost . . . that the Church of the sub-apostolic age drew tight its organisation and thus braced itself to meet the dangers and opportunities of the day. This admission is apt to be misunderstood by Anglicans and Free Churchmen alike. Free Churchmen think they are being asked to accept episcopacy as the one divinely given order of Church government; Anglicans think they are being justified in their intransigence. On the contrary, while we are clearly being called to unity, it by no means follows that the Holy Spirit which led the Church into episcopacy in the second century will lead it to episcopacy in the twentieth; and, if it be to episcopacy that we are led, it certainly will not be to that of Ignatius or of Leo or to that of yesterday.'

It is rather interesting to compare the treatment given by our two authors respectively to the 'ejectment' of 1662. From Frau Schaefer we learn only that 'the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1662, a law which forced everyone to accept the Prayer Book for everyday use.' No mention

is made of the cantankerous two thousand who would not be forced and went forth into outer darkness. To Dr. Micklem this piece of religious *fascismo* 'was a national disaster,' and the Church of England 'inflicted irreparable injury upon itself; it created Nonconformity, it compelled the disunion of the Church in England for future centuries.' Dr. Micklem might well have made the further point (which gets the enemy between the joints of his harness) that the 1662 Act was passed by *Parliament* against the wishes of the King, who was, according to Anglican theory, head of the Church. The spiritual authority of the 'Cavalier Parliament' could only be accepted by the most naked and unashamed Erastian.

Readers of the *Modern Churchman* will note with satisfaction that Dr. Micklem, in outlining his principles for a reunited Church, lays it down that it 'must have the largest theological and intellectual liberty that is consonant with common loyalty to the Christian Gospel.'

The modest price of Dr. Micklem's book sets it within the reach even of a parochial clergyman. But it is to be hoped also that our Church dignitaries will find a moment to glance through it, for they will soon have to begin the task of constructing a policy for the Lambeth Conference of 1940. Will they have the courage to tackle once more the thorny problems of reunion?

J. C. Hardwick.

SHAKESPEARE AND CHRISTIANITY*

It would seem that a book on Shakespearian production could not come within the scope of the *Modern Churchman* for review, but in this case the contrary is true, because in Professor Wilson Knight's book Christian thought is recurrent, and those who are familiar with his Shakespearian interpretations, *The Wheel of Fire, The Imperial Theme* and *The Shakespearian Tempest,* and his vitally important book *The Christian Renaissance,* will know that he has long been urging the fact that:

> 'Christianity has all the time been implicit in Shakespeare's work, and the two to-day form a necessary and most fertile commentary on each other' (p. 231).

In his new book Mr. Knight, himself a well-known Shakespearian producer both in England and in Canada, outlines the methods by which the theories propounded in his interpretations may be put into practice in actual production. His concern with the symbolism of Shakespeare's plays is clearly of the highest importance, since it reveals an aspect that has hitherto been too little recognised: their eternal and universal significance. We may therefore well expect far-reaching results from the type of production he suggests:

> 'It might bring back to us an approach to great art, both communal and intelligent; might help to solidify groups of our people of various classes and casts of mind in one common fusion of spiritual understanding, that is, understanding of the fundamental laws of life; be a bridge between the various complications of human existence and the central truths of Christianity; give us again, as a nation, a sense of national and Christian purpose' (pp. 236-7).

The last and, from the Christian point of view, the most interesting, chapter, 'Shakespeare and Ritual,' begins with the words:

> 'Great drama is something more than entertainment. Rather would

* *Principles of Shakespearian Production.* By G. Wilson Knight. (Faber and Faber. 1936. 10/6.)

> I call it a ceremony in which actors and audience share in the formal unfurling of some deeply significant pattern' (p. 217).

He pleads that Shakespeare be produced with reverence and dignity, with understanding and intellectual humility. In this chapter the concept of sacrifice, its creative power, the correspondence between the tragic sacrifices in Shakespeare and the Christian sacrifice, and—an aspect which may at first appear startling to some—the relation of the Shakespearian play to the Christian Mass, are discussed with the profound understanding and wisdom inherent in all Mr. Wilson Knight's work. A study of the chapter on 'The Ideal Production,' and particularly of the production of 'Macbeth,' will show clearly how the underlying symbolism, Christian implications and ethical aspects of the Shakespearian play may be revealed.

It will be seen from this very brief notice, which cannot in any way attempt to do justice to the book, that all connected with the Church and interested in theatrical production will find in it not only inspiration and guidance, but also the practical means by which these vital aspects of Shakespeare can be revealed.

DALLAS KENMARE.

A FAITHLESS FAITH*

At first reading, the lectures of Professor Dewey are ambiguous. So learned a reviewer as Henry Nelson Wieman reported that Dr. Dewey had turned theist, and was later to find that Dr. Dewey did not mean theism at all. In the end, all that is discovered to be a basis for a 'common faith' is a simple non-theistic humanism, in which values are to be sought for their own sake. In developing this thesis, there are several valuable distinctions which are made.

First of all, there is a distinction between *religion* and the *religious*. Religion as such, according to Professor Dewey, is a group of beliefs (unsubstantiated except by the questionable scrip of intuition) supposedly revealed by the one true God. Historic religions are relative to the social cultures in which they arose. Each religion has, therefore, varied in its concept of deity, worship, and morality. And all present religions are conceived in the light of ancient cosmology and society. Of course, if this is religion, we would agree with Dr. Dewey that it is outmoded; but it seems to the reviewer that Dr. Dewey is not discussing any vital sort of religion now present in society. He is throwing stones at windows which were broken some decades ago. While the noun *religion*

> 'always signifies a special body of beliefs and practices having some kind of institutional organization, loose or tight, the adjective *religious* denotes nothing in the way of a specifiable entity, either institutional or as a system of beliefs. . . . It denotes attitudes that may be taken toward every object and every proposed end or ideal' (pp. 9-10).

With our allegiance to the *religious*, we must adopt what he styles the 'Logic of Modernism,' which

> 'demands that in imagination we wipe the slate clean and start afresh by asking what would be the idea of the unseen, of the manner of its control over us and ways in which reverence and obedience would be manifested, if whatever were basically religious in experience had the opportunity to express itself free from all historic encumbrances' (p. 6).

* *A Common Faith.* By John Dewey. Terry Foundation Lectures at Yale. (Yale University Press.)

This is being far too high-handed with tradition, but that some such purging of religious thinking is badly needed cannot be doubted.

There is in Dr. Dewey's work no denial of the religious experience. It is maintained, however, that any experience may be religious and that there is no specific religious experience. Furthermore, religious experience has no knowledge value. Such reasoning is fallacious.

> 'The actual religious quality in the experience described is the *effect* produced, the better adjustment in life and its conditions, not the manner and cause of its production' (p. 14).
>
> 'Any ideal pursued in behalf of an ideal end against obstacles and in spite of threats of personal loss, because of conviction of its general and enduring value, is religious' (p. 27).

One might ask what this passage means to a humanist. Is ramming one's head against a stone wall to be courageous in the service of ideals? Or is the universe friendly, although there is no theistic God? If by friendly one means that the universe has been a place where emergence and growth, both physical and spiritual, have taken place, the verdict of history, Dr. Dewey thinks, is at least hesitantly 'Yes.' Ideals have emerged.

> 'Aims, ideals, do not exist simply in "mind"; they exist in character, in personality, and action. . . . The aims and ideals that move us are generated in the imagination, but they are not made out of imaginary stuff. They are made out of the hard stuff of the world of physical and social experience. . . . The new vision does not arise out of nothing, but emerges through seeing, in terms of possibilities, that is, of imagination, old things in new relations serving a new end which the new end aids in creating. . . . The sense of new values that become ends to be realized arises first in dim and uncertain form. As the values are dwelt upon and carried forward in action they grow in definiteness and coherence. Interaction between aim and existent conditions improves and tests the ideal; and conditions are at the same time modified. . . . When the vital factors in this process are generally acknowledged in emotion, thought and action, the process will be both accelerated and purified through elimination of that irrelevant element that culminates in the supernatural. . . . There are forces in nature and society that generate and support the ideals. They are further unified by the action that gives them coherence and solidity. It is this *active* relation between ideal and actual to which I would give the name "God." I would not insist that the name *must* be given. . . . The *function* of such a working union of the ideal and actual seems to me to be identical with the force that has in fact been attached to the conception of God in all religions that have a spiritual content' (pp. 48-52).

This point of view is not atheistic. It is obviously not theistic, either, although some of the words in the last quotation remind one of Wieman's position. The religious attitude demands some sense of the connection of man and the universe, based upon selective choice of favourable factors. There is a power of good, or it may be powers. And they work 'within as well as without.'

Dr. Dewey maintains that science, in the end, is the only way to truth, provided we accept that term in its wider and operational sense. This does not deny the actuality of mystical experience, but it allows science to examine it for what it is worth. It is science which has directly affected the life of present-day civilization; it is science which has indirectly destroyed the capacities of organized religion by setting up competing organizations

which are more effective. On this point Dr. Dewey may be partly correct, but it still remains a fact that approximately 90 per cent. of the criminals come from the 40 per cent. of non-religious homes in the United States.

The Catholic Church has emphasized the sacramental values of religion, and has not been bothered by science in so far as it does not interfere with sacraments and disciplines. The Protestants have been interested in the salvation of the individual, and have not been concerned with social and moral changes outside a limited sphere. Dr. Dewey is blind to the newly-awakened social consciousness of American Protestantism, which extends to the Protestant Episcopal Church. Furthermore, when Dr. Dewey maintains that real changes in social affairs have not been made by the co-operation of religious institutions, but by the *humanizing forces of society,* he forgets the impact of religion upon social consciousness.

But Dr. Dewey gets into trouble when he seeks a dynamic for his religious attitude. Humanistic religion rests upon intelligence, which is inadequate for social action unless it leads to action. But

> 'there is such a thing as *passionate intelligence,* as ardour in behalf of light shining into murky places of social existence, and as zeal for its refreshing and purifying effect' (p. 79).
>
> 'A clear and intense conception of a union of ideal ends with actual conditions is capable of arousing steady emotion' (p. 59).

Even if one is swayed by these expressions of dynamic reason, the case is given away a few pages later:

> 'Were men and women actuated throughout the length and breadth of human relations with the faith and ardour that have at times marked historic religions, the consequences would be incalculable' (p. 82).

Finally, whatever God is, His actual unification takes place in the human imagination. God is really just a symbol of the general functions and trends toward value. And the only conscious power toward good is the human mind. And the only dynamic is passionate intelligence. This is, in the last analysis, a sorry substitute for the richness of the Christian tradition; and that it is not inevitable may be shown by examining the conclusions of others who begin with presuppositions similar to Dr. Dewey's.

Yale University. RANDOLPH C. MILLER

CORRESPONDENCE

DR. S. A. COOK AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS.

SIR, To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

It would be interesting to read a further discussion by Dr. Cook of his statement in Section 8 of his articles on Biblical Criticism that 'Christianity did not evolve naturally out of the thought of its age' but 'came from outside' (p. 184).

Does Dr. Cook imply that the minds of the first Christians were exempt from normal psychological processes?

And by 'Christianity' does he mean the Synoptic teaching of Jesus, or the interpretation of Christ's person and teaching by New Testament and Patristic writers? Even if he feels the former to have been rightly interpreted in the latter, it would still be interesting to know what features in either Dr. Cook considers to have come 'from outside' and not to have been implicit already in Jewish or Graeco-Oriental thought. Surely one of the important results of Biblical criticism and archaeology is a realization

of the fact that the originality of Christianity lay in its new selection of truths already half-realised, its change of emphasis within accepted systems of thought. Granted that, having first acted as a broadening influence within the safe limits of sub-prophetic Judaism, in the sphere of Hellenism it 'took and transformed' (and inevitably narrowed), but wherein did it innovate, and where in this history do we find anything other than 'natural' in its evolution?

E. DE WARD.

45 Princes Square, W.2.
October 3rd, 1936.

DR. COOK'S REPLY.

SIR,

On p. 184 (Section 8) I wrote that Christianity 'came "from outside," as it were, taking and transforming what it needed, and inaugurating a new line of development'; and in a footnote I commented upon 'transforming' rather than 'reforming' elements and upon 'discontinuities' as well as 'continuities.' By 'outside' I did not mean, of course, another region, *e.g.* Egypt or Parthia. Were one asked where to draw the line between 'outside' and 'inside,' between 'transforming' and 'reforming,' and between 'discontinuities' and 'continuities,' one would at once be in the midst of extremely difficult but fascinating problems which — and this was my point — are constantly arising in the fields of religious and secular thought. Are we to consider as normal and natural the intense experiences of mysticism, conversion, revivalism and the like? We have further to recognise that the crudest examples of what *we* should call 'supernaturalism' were evidently perfectly 'natural' to some people, while to the prophets of old the God of the Universe was assuredly 'natural,' even though His thoughts were not men's thoughts. Is one not entitled, if not compelled, to speak of that which comes '"from outside," as it were'— the very wording is apologetic !—in order to mark the *qualitative* difference between all ordinary religious and other experience and those highly special occasions when a new force and authority gives new impetus to the whole life? If we find ourselves speaking of the 'other' world, or a life 'beyond,' or the 'wholly other,' is it not that we human beings in this world of space and time are compelled to give this distinctiveness to certain intuitions, experiences and convictions which we regard, not as normal, nor as ab- or sub-normal, but as super-normal? May one not think that St. Paul, St. Augustine and Luther — to name no others — felt that something had come from 'outside,' even though 'normal psychological processes' were involved? In the same way, love itself is as 'natural' as ordinary human affection, but we should agree that there is a vast *qualitative* difference between X's affection for Y and the overwhelming, soul-filling passion which inaugurates a new stage in his life.

One may say that what we call 'God' is no part of the 'natural' world of the physical sciences, but an integral part of the larger universe of the scientist *qua* human being, whether he be conscious of this or not. Thus there is the 'natural' world of space and time—Nature, and the 'natural' world of those to whom all religious truths, though transcendent, are also 'natural'; and a great deal of confusion is caused because we think partly as occupants of this smaller world and partly as conscious or unconscious members of the ultimate universe of which the sciences give us only a very partial and imperfect knowledge. And we have to maintain that 'God' is transcendent, not only because a merely immanent God soon loses all distinctiveness and is felt not to be so real as the Self, but also because in the

history of religions men constantly feel a new life-giving power coming from 'outside' their accustomed world of life and thought: it is an expression of the recurrent discovery that our whole psychical development is incomplete.

Among the first Christians there were of course 'normal psychological processes'; but the consciousness of a new illumination, a new stage, or a new start-off, is not confined to religion, and it is an exceedingly interesting task to compare the 'before' and 'after,' to see what is new and what is old, and to appraise the psychological and ideological processes involved. Christianity, it seems to me, gave a force and content to the conception of the Fatherhood of God which it had never possessed before. The Body of Christ and the mystical relation between Christ and this 'body,' indeed the new approach to God, are as little Jewish as the fact that the old conception of Wisdom-Logos is treated in a new and peculiarly pregnant and non-Jewish manner. It was a time when not only men but also ideas and conceptions and bodies of thought were being 'born again.' We have to understand the bifurcation, in the first century A.D., into (1) a Judaism which was continuous with the past and a natural part of the thought of its age, and (2) a Christianity which took over and re-spiritualised ideas (*e.g.* pre-existence, the idea of being first-born), so that thenceforth the two religions went different ways. There is no record whatever of any other historical person of that age so significant as Jesus, and Christ as ἀρχή (*Coloss.* i, 18) was regarded as an originator or initiator. See Lightfoot's note; also J. L. Myres, *The Political Ideas of the Greeks* (1927), Index, *s.* Arkhe; and W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites,* 3rd ed., pp. xlix, 584, n. 3.

So the question wherein lay the 'originality' of Christianity raises the question as to what really constitutes true, persisting and helpful 'originality' in all life and thought. It is more than a 'new selection of truths already half realised'; even as the work of a Newton or an Einstein is more than a rearrangement of letters and symbols — it is something pervasive and impelling. There is a 'life' that issues from all men of personal worth such that we assimilate not only the new facts and theories they give us, but something of the 'spirit' that gave and still gives them vital and pregnant power.

After all, we shall understand the New Testament better when we can more vividly realise the feeling that an entirely new age was dawning: of this the early Christians were assured. We ourselves hear enough of the end of this age and the like (*e.g.* N. Berdyaev, *The End of our Time,* 1933), and presumably many Fascists and Communists are perfectly assured that they are witnessing the dawn of a new age. But does it grow 'naturally' out of the thought of modern Europe? Is it not rather a reaction against it? For my part I am struck to-day by the two diverging tendencies: one towards a drastic social revolution, the other towards a religious reformation: both are of world-wide import. Should the latter materialise — as I believe it will — then indeed we, or another generation, shall see in what sense a new age can 'evolve naturally,' or is due to impulse '"from outside," as it were.' When, for example, Streeter (*Buddha and the Christ,* 1932) says 'this is a day of promise and of hope' and speaks of 'a fresh start,' the last words clearly imply something other than an ordinary development or growth. The very argument among Marxists that the dialectical process leads to a new social-economic creation in their hoped-for Communist society really enforces the fact that it leads more obviously to a much-needed Reformation.

But, throughout, technical questions of psychological and ideological processes are involved, and what underlies my pages on 'Biblical Criticism and the Interpretation of History' are the two convictions, one that the interpretation of the great creative ages to which we owe the Old and New Testaments and the historical process in which we are now living to-day cannot be dissociated; the other that the whole world of thought is involved, seeing that a living and progressive religion depends for its vitality and appeal upon an entirely 'rational' relation between its essential truths and the principles which are accepted as essential in all departments of research. Christianity is not only a life to be lived; it is an experience to be thought out.

STANLEY A. COOK.

26 Lensfield Road, Cambridge.

'TRADITIONALIST CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIAN MODERNISM.'

SIR,

Your attack upon Mr. Blakeney's 'traditional' position is bold, good-tempered and honest. You are not, however, fortunate in pitching on Eternal Punishment as proof of reactionary views. It is strongly held by the foremost scholars, Inge, H. A. W. Meyer and Swete. Inge writes:

> 'The substitution for the Catholic doctrine strikes at the root of the chief argument for Immortality — the inherent indestructibility of the soul . . . Eternal Punishment may not be popular, but we must make our choice between the God of Christianity and *le bon Dieu* of popular sentiment.'

Inge then appositely quotes the late Sir Leslie Stephen: 'Hell must be an integral part of Christianity so long as radical convictions retain their genuine vitality . . . Eternal Damnation is . . . a logical deduction from the Creed.' Professor Swete in his famous commentary writes:

> 'From the Lake of Fire there is no release unless Evil itself should be ultimately consumed. And over that possibility there lies a veil which our author does not help us to lift or pierce' (Swete, *ad Rev.* xx, 10).

Lastly comes the most famous classic and exegete of the New Testament in the Germany of his day, H. A. W. Meyer:

> 'The absolute idea of Eternity in regard to the punishment of Hell is not to be got rid of by a popular toning down of the force of "eternal" . . . It is established . . . in the passage *Matt.* xxv, 46, by the opposing "eternal life" . . . It is a figurative representation of the extremely painful and endless punishment of Hell, not merely the terrors of conscience (Meyer *ad Matt.* xxv, 46, and *Mk.* ix, 48).'

The Rectory, Devizes. A. H. T. CLARKE.

[We doubt whether the authorities quoted by our correspondent are in conflict with what we wrote in the July *Modern Churchman* in reply to Mr. Blakeney's challenge to Modernism. Perhaps we may be pardoned for repeating it.

> 'When Mr. Blakeney writes that Jesus taught "Eternal Punishment" directly and that it is as much a part of His teaching as the Fatherhood of God and the Forgiveness of Sins, Modernists will ask: Have we any right to interpret the teaching of Jesus about "Eternal Punishment" in such a way as to conflict with a true belief in the Fatherhood of God and in the Forgiveness of Sins? It is this which much traditionalist teaching about "Eternal Punishment" has done. It has reduced the Fatherhood of God to unreality and the Forgiveness

of Sins to a travesty. No Modernist denies that in the future state we shall and must suffer if suffering be necessary to promote our moral and spiritual progress: in short, that "eternal punishment" is not everlasting but is reformative, educative, and must *end* in the salvation of the sufferer.'

If the above statement does conflict with the authorities cited by Mr. Clarke, at least it is in harmony with the teaching of F. D. Maurice, Dean Rashdall and the *anima humana naturaliter Christiana* of their many disciples who believe both in the love and in the righteousness of the Divine Father.—EDITOR, *M.C.*]

SIR, PERCY DEARMER, D.D. A BELATED TRIBUTE.

Will you kindly allow one Old Westminster to pay a modest tribute to another? Much has been written of Percy Dearmer, of his fine hatred of falsity and shams, of his love of beauty, and his effort to set free the challenge of Christ from the shackles of conventionalism and the tyranny of dogma. His books, *The Sin Obsession, The Truth about Fasting, The Legend of Hell, The Escape from Idolatry* and *Christianity as a New Religion,* shed light for many across the road to truth, while at the same time provoking much angry opposition, and, dare one say, jealousy from a large section of the Church of England, to whom churchmanship means more than Christianity. Yet this was an exceptionally nice man, and to speak with him was an inspiration. It might only be about the treasures of the Abbey, yet there was something about him that drew out the best in you. You couldn't help feeling happier and more alive than before, with a heightened perception of truth, beauty and goodness.

For Percy Dearmer was strangely near in spirit to the Founder of Christianity. He was never appreciated, never understood. This kingdom of freedom and happiness was far too pleasant and easy: it meant the abandonment of the crude doctrines of propitiation and atonement: it upset 'definite Church teaching.' So people dropped him and were often rude, even unkind to him. But he was a big man, incapable of petty feelings, and bitterness was utterly alien to his generous nature.

So he returned to Westminster, near to the school where he had been as a boy. He was still young in heart, and soon most boys knew that friendly smile and that warm word of greeting. It was an amazing thing: Percy Dearmer seemed to have a smile and word for everyone.

His sermons in the Abbey were just like himself: effortless, genuine, invigorating and fresh. For his faith was an inspiration to him: you could tell it by the gleam in his eyes and by the note in his voice. His sweetness must have uplifted all who met him, for he radiated the spirit of Christ and spread infectiously His sunny kingdom of freedom and happiness.

Marston Hall, Grantham, Lincolnshire. J. R. H. THOROLD.
August 24th, 1936.

ERRATA.

p. 422, l. 4, *for* Jall *read* Gall.
p. 423, l. 10, *for* Thorvold Kierkegoard *read* Thorvald Kierkegaard.
p. 423, l. 11, *for* Grundtoig *read* Grundtvig.
p. 424, l. 8, *for* Taire *read* Taine.
p. 424, l. 20, *for* Alsatian *read* Augsburg.
p. 424, l. 29, *for* stronger *read* strange.
p. 424, l. 35, *for* Niewoller *read* Niemöller.